

REFERENCE ONLY



2809286849

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON THESIS

Degree phd Year 2007 Name of Author MARY JOHANNA
HUNTER

COPYRIGHT

This is a thesis accepted for a Higher Degree of the University of London. It is an unpublished typescript and the copyright is held by the author. All persons consulting the thesis must read and abide by the Copyright Declaration below.

COPYRIGHT DECLARATION

I recognise that the copyright of the above-described thesis rests with the author and that no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author.

LOAN

Theses may not be lent to individuals, but the University Library may lend a copy to approved libraries within the United Kingdom, for consultation solely on the premises of those libraries. Application should be made to: The Theses Section, University of London Library, Senate House, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HU.

REPRODUCTION

University of London theses may not be reproduced without explicit written permission from the University of London Library. Enquiries should be addressed to the Theses Section of the Library. Regulations concerning reproduction vary according to the date of acceptance of the thesis and are listed below as guidelines.

- A. Before 1962. Permission granted only upon the prior written consent of the author. (The University Library will provide addresses where possible).
- B. 1962 - 1974. In many cases the author has agreed to permit copying upon completion of a Copyright Declaration.
- C. 1975 - 1988. Most theses may be copied upon completion of a Copyright Declaration.
- D. 1989 onwards. Most theses may be copied.

This thesis comes within category D.

- ☐ This copy has been deposited in the Library of UCL
- ☐ This copy has been deposited in the University of London Library, Senate House, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HU.

**Collecting Bodies:
Art, Medicine and Sexuality
in late Nineteenth-Century France**

Mary Hunter
PhD Thesis
History of Art
University College London

UMI Number: U592101

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U592101

Published by ProQuest LLC 2013. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Abstract

This thesis examines the interconnected discourses of art and medicine during the late nineteenth century in Paris by exploring the effects the ‘medicalization’ of society had on visual culture and, concurrently, the effects that artistic styles and conventions had on medical iconography. It investigates how artists and doctors worked together to produce realistic representations of bodies, diseases and sexualities. By concentrating on the portraits of three men of science and medicine (Louis Pasteur, Jules Emile Péan and Jean-Martin Charcot) exhibited at the 1887 Salon in Paris, as well as the many images and objects that these men collected, commissioned and created, this thesis explores how artists appropriated, and sought to imitate, the scientific model in order to construct representations of bodies that were considered as real and truthful as possible. By examining the competing claims to truth made by different mediums, stylistic practices and professions, this thesis questions realist claims to objectivity and sincerity, and explores realisms’ multiple roles and guises.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
List of Illustrations	4
Acknowledgements	21
Introduction	23
1 The Making of a Scientific Hero: Portraiture and Louis Pasteur	39
Portraiture at the 1886 Salon	40
Men at Work: Realism and Portraiture	43
Head Shots: Photographic Portraits of Pasteur and other Scientists	53
Pasteur's Body: Aging, Illness and Vision	63
Showing Off: Portraiture, Nationalism, and Commerce	71
"Doctor Pasteur": Gsell's Portrait of Pasteur at the 1887 Salon	83
Representing the Vaccinated Other: Pasteur's Patients	88
Conclusion: A Final Portrait	103
2 The Sleep of Reason: Doctor Péan's Collection of Bodies in Wax and in Paint	105
Gervex's realist portrait at the 1887 Salon	106
Front Row Seats: Identity, Republicanism and Spectatorship in Group Portraiture	112
Libidinal Looking: The Artist/Doctor/Client and his Model/Patient/Prostitute	125
Péan's Spectacular Theatre: Competing Constructions of Reality	134
Realism beyond Reason: Sleeping Beauties	141
Péan's collection of wax body parts	156
Conclusion: "Éffroyable réalisme"	163
3 Hysterical Realisms: Representing Reality at the Salpêtrière	166
Hysteria Beyond Construction and Rebellion	170
Visual Borrowing: Charcot's Clinic, Books and Commissions	174
"Elle ne confond pas la fantaisie avec la science": Realism and Light	187
Brouillet's Construction of Heroic Men and Sick Women: Precedents in Paint and Photography	192
Photography at the Salpêtrière: Scientific Pictures and Procedures	202
Frenzied Realisms: Competing Claims to Truth	210
In the Bedroom: Touching the Hysterical Body	217
"From the moment she is hypnotized she belongs to us": Hypnosis as Realist Performance	223
Electrotherapy as Realist Brush	233
Conclusion: "Triste archives de l'humanité souffrante"	237
Conclusion	239
Illustrations	241
Bibliography	328

List of Illustrations

1. Illustration from “Le Virus Pictural”, *La Revue Illustrée*, I, 1887, p.337.
2. Léon Bonnat, *Pasteur et son petite fille Camille*, 1886, oil on canvas, approx. 160 x 130 cm, Paris, Musée Pasteur.
3. Albert Edelfelt, *Louis Pasteur*, 1885, oil on canvas, 158 x 130 cm, Paris, Musée d’Orsay.
4. Lucien Laurent-Gsell, *Le Laboratoire de M. Pasteur*, 1886, oil on canvas, 91 x 78 cm, Vannes, Musée de Vannes.
5. F. Pirondon after Lucien Laurent-Gsell, *La vaccine de la rage au laboratoire de M. Pasteur*, lithograph, 1887, 39.9 x 46.5 cm, London, The Wellcome Institute Library.
6. Henri Gervex, *Avant l’opération: le Docteur Péan enseignant à l’hôpital Saint-Louis sa découverte du pincement des vaisseaux*, 1887, oil on canvas, 242 x 188 cm, Paris, Musée d’Orsay.
7. André Brouillet, *Une leçon clinique à La Salpêtrière*, 1887, oil on canvas, 300 x 425 cm, Paris, Musée d’Histoire de la Médecine.
8. Edouard Manet, *Zola*, 1868, oil on canvas, 146 x 114 cm, Paris, Musée d’Orsay.
9. William Sharp after Sir Joshua Reynolds’ painting of 1786, *John Hunter*, 1788, line engraving, 51 x 38.3 cm, London, National Portrait Gallery.
10. Alexis Lemaistre, “M. Pasteur”, from *L’institut de France et nos grands établissements scientifiques*, (Paris, 1896).
11. Alexis Lemaistre, “L’inoculation à L’Institut Pasteur”, from *L’institut de France et nos grands établissements scientifiques*, (Paris, 1896).
12. Alexis Lemaistre, “La trépanation du lapin”, from *L’institut de France et nos grands établissements scientifiques*, (Paris, 1896).
13. “Louis Pasteur” from *Vanity Fair*, 8 January 1887.
14. Gilbert-Martin, “L’Ange d’Inoculation”, from *Le Don Quichotte*, 14 March 1886.
15. Alexis Lemaistre, “La table des microbes”, from *L’institut de France et nos grands établissements scientifiques*, (Paris, 1896).
16. Alexis Lemaistre, “Le cours de médecine”, from *L’institut de France et nos grands établissements scientifiques*, (Paris, 1896).

17. After Lucien Laurent-Gsell, "Study for Le Laboratoire de M. Pasteur", from the "Salon de 1886" issue of *L'Art*, engraving, 1886, Paris, Musée Pasteur.
18. École de médecine, Paris 2005.
19. Félix Nadar, *Jules Michelet*, 1856-9, photograph, Paris, Musée Carnavalet.
20. Léon Bonnat, *Christ en croix*, oil on canvas, 1874, Paris, Palais de Justice.
21. Pierre Petit, *Pasteur*, early 1860s, lithograph on paper, London, The Wellcome Institute Library.
22. Félix Nadar, *Pasteur*, c. 1878, photograph.
23. Félix Nadar, *Pasteur*, c. 1878, carte de visite.
24. Félix Nadar, *Pasteur*, c. 1878, photograph given by Nadar to Doctor Roux in 1886, Paris, Musée Pasteur.
25. Alphonse Bertillon, 1888, Bertillon system card, London, University College London.
26. Alphonse Bertillon, "Identité individuelle avec dissemblance physiognomique", c. 1888, Bertillon system card, Paris, Préfecture de Police.
27. Felix Nadar, *Pasteur*, c. 1878, photograph.
28. Pasteur's photograph of Henri Etienne Saint-Claire Deville c. 1881, Paris, Musée Pasteur.
29. Pasteur's photograph of Henri-Victor Regnault, late nineteenth century, Paris, Musée Pasteur.
30. Robert Walker, *Portrait of John Evelyn*, 1648, oil on canvas, 87.9 x 64.1 cm, London, National Portrait Gallery.
31. Mary and Thomas Black, *Messenger Monsey*, 1764, oil on canvas, 127 x 101.5 cm, London, Royal College of Surgeons.
32. Albrecht Durer, *Melancholia I*, 1514, engraving, 24.1 x 18.8 cm, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art.
33. Studio Dornac et Cie, *Pasteur*, c. 1888, photograph, London, The Wellcome Institute Library.
34. Blanquart-Evrard Louis-Désiré, *Portrait de Jean-Baptiste Biot*, calotype photograph, 1847, Paris, Musée Pasteur.

35. Victor Regnault, *The chemist Thomas Graham*, c. 1851, modern print from paper negative, 20.1 x 16.4 cm, Paris, Société Française de Photographie.
36. After a photograph by Pierre Petit, “Blessure produite par la morsure d’un loup enragé”, from *La Nature*, engraving, 29 May 1886, p. 401.
37. Louis Pasteur, *Portrait of M. Pasteur*, 1842, pastel, Paris, Musée Pasteur.
38. Léon Bonnat, *Portrait d’Adolphe Thiers*, 1876, oil on canvas, 115 x 92 cm, Versailles, Musée National du Château de Versailles.
39. Cartoon published in *Le Rire*, 1895.
40. J.J. Henner, *Portrait of Pasteur’s Daughter*, oil on canvas, Paris, Musée Pasteur.
41. J.J. Henner, *Portrait of Louis Pasteur*, oil on canvas, Paris, Musée Pasteur.
42. Paul Dubois, *Louis Pasteur*, 1880, bronze bust, Paris, Musée Pasteur.
43. Peder Severin Krøyer, *Le Comité de l’Exposition française à Copenhague 1888 présidé par L. Pasteur*, oil on canvas, 144 x 221 cm, Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek.
44. “M. Pasteur et la Rage”, cover of *Le Grelot*, 8 November 1885.
45. Eugène-Ernest Hillemacher, *Edward Jenner vaccinating a boy*, 1884, oil on canvas, 73.1 x 92.7 cm, London, The Wellcome Institute Library.
46. Ernest Board, *Dr. Jenner performing his first vaccination on a child 1796*, c. 1920, oil on canvas, 61.5 x 92 cm, London, The Wellcome Institute Library.
47. Émile Bayard, *Séance d’inoculation contre la rage à l’École normale supérieure*, gouache, c. 1886, Paris, Musée Pasteur.
48. “La Chocolaterie d’Aiguebelle”, advertisement, c. 1890, chromolithograph on paper, 7 x 11 cm.
49. “Chocolat Carpentier”, advertisement, c. 1895-1900, chromolithograph on paper, 6.9 x 10.2 cm.
50. Thiriat, engraving from M.C. Gilbert, “Les opérations de vaccine de la rage au laboratoire de M. Pasteur”, from *La Nature*, 1886, 14, 1, p. 213.
51. Jean-Gaspard Jules Gsell, stained glass windows, c. 1870, Paris, Musée Pasteur.
52. Detail of J.-G. Gsell window.

53. Detail of J.-G. Gsell window.
54. Detail of Bayard, *Séance d'inoculation*.
55. Engraving after an amateur photograph, "Groupe des Arabes mordus par les chiens enragés, venus à Paris pour subir le traitement prophylactique de M. Pasteur", from *La Nature*, 29 May 1886, p. 401.
56. "Les Russes en traitement chez Monsieur Pasteur", cover of *L'Illustration*, 27 March 1886.
57. "Smolensk Russians at Hôtel-Dieu to receive Pasteur's rabies vaccination", photograph, 1886, Paris, Musée Pasteur.
58. "M. Pasteur's experiments in Paris for the cure of hydrophobia – The doctor and some of his patients", from *The Graphic*, wood engraving, London, The Wellcome Institute Library.
59. C.J. Stanilard from a sketch by A. Cox and C. Henschel, "The Ashanti expedition: vaccination parade on board the steamer Bathurst", from *The Graphic*, 1873, London, The Wellcome Institute Library.
60. Truffot, *J-B Jupille*, 1888, bronze, Paris, Pasteur Institute.
61. "Plan général de l'Institut Pasteur" [top] and "Plan du premiere étage des bâtiments principaux" [bottom], from *La Nature*, engraving, 24 November 1888, p. 404.
62. Poyet after a photograph, "Vue d'ensemble de l'Institut Pasteur", engraving, from *La Nature*, 24 November 1888, p. 405.
63. Engraving after sculpture by Truffot, "Le berger Jupille luttant contre un chien enragé, groupe en bronze placé à l'entrée de l'Institut Pasteur", from *La Nature*, 24 November 1888, p. 405.
64. "L'Institut Pasteur", engraving, from *L'Univers Illustré*, 24 November 1888, p. 742.
65. "L'Institut Pasteur", engraving, 1888, Paris, Musée Pasteur.
66. Uzes, "Le Bon Pasteur", from *Le Courier Français*, late nineteenth century.
67. Alfred Le Petit, "The Good Shepherd", from *Le Charivari*, 27 April 1882.
68. Handbill advertising the appearance of The Newark Boys at a Philadelphia dime museum, c. 1886, Paris, Musée Pasteur.

69. Henri Chapu, *Madame Baucicaut*, 1888, marble, 76 x 29 x 53 cm, Paris, Pasteur Institute.
70. Unknown, *Alexandre III, Emperor of Russia*, c.1890, plaster, 93 x 29 x 53 cm, Paris, Pasteur Institute.
71. Eugène Guillaume, *Pedro II, Emperor of Brasil*, 1890, marble, 86 x 30 x 56 cm, Paris, Pasteur Institute.
72. Worms-Godfary, *Baron de Rothschild*, marble, 1889, 66.5 x 24 x 42 cm, Paris, Pasteur Institute.
73. Ernest Guilbert, *Madame Furtado-Heine*, marble, 1890, 87 x 17 x 70 cm, Paris, Pasteur Institute.
74. Portalis, *Comte de Laubespain*, marble, 1889, 70 x 50 x 29 cm, Paris, Pasteur Institute.
75. Photograph of Pasteur's funeral procession, 5 October 1895, Paris, Musée Pasteur.
76. Pasteur's mausoleum at the Pasteur Institute, Paris.
77. Mosaic of "Charité" and "Science" in Pasteur's mausoleum at the Pasteur Institute, Paris.
78. Mosaic of rabid dogs in Pasteur's mausoleum at the Pasteur Institute, Paris.
79. Plaster death mask of Pasteur in Pasteur's mausoleum at the Pasteur Institute, Paris.
80. Henri Gervex, *L'autopsie à l'Hôtel-Dieu*, 1876, oil on canvas, 302 x 232 cm, lost.
81. Engraving from "Le Salon", from *L'Univers Illustré*, 7 May 1887, p. 295.
82. Henri Gervex, study for *Avant l'opération*, pencil on paper, 28.5 x 28.3 cm, Paris, private collection.
83. Pean's tomb, Paris, Montmartre cemetery.
84. Pean's tomb, Paris, Montmartre cemetery.
85. Pean's tomb detail, Paris, Montmartre cemetery.
86. Pean's tomb detail, Paris, Montmartre cemetery.
87. Detail of Gervex, *Avant l'opération*.
88. Henri Gervex, *Portrait de Docteur Blanche*, c. 1880, oil on canvas, 56 x 47.5 cm, Dieppe, Château-musée de Dieppe.

89. Rembrandt van Rijn, *The Anatomy Lesson of Doctor Nicolaes Tulp*, 1632, oil on canvas, 169.5 x 216.5 cm, The Hague, Mauritshuis.
90. Léopold Flameng after Rembrandt, *The Anatomy Lesson of Doctor Nicolaes Tulp*, 1876, engraving, published by Cadart.
91. Francois Nicolas Augustin Feyen-Perrin, *La Leçon d'anatomie de Docteur Velpeau*, 1864, oil on canvas, 170 x 233 cm, Tours, Musée des Beaux-Arts de Tours.
92. Culiale, "J'espère qu'il ne va pas me faire payer cette opératon là!", from *L'Assiette au Beurre*, c.1905, colour lithograph, 25.8 x 20.8 cm, London, The Wellcome Institute Library.
93. Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec, *L'Artisan Moderne*, 1896, lithograph, 92 x 65 cm.
94. Felicien Rops, *Médecine expérimentale*, c. 1880, heliogravure, 25.5 x 17.7 cm.
95. Jean-Louis Forain, *The Client*, 1878, pencil, watercolour and gouache on paper, 24.7 x 32.8 cm, Memphis, Tennessee, The Dixon Gallery and Gardens.
96. Constantin Guys, *Ces Dames au Salon*, date uncertain, pen and ink with wash, Paris, Collection Dorville.
97. Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec, *Rue des Moulins*, 1894, oil on cardboard on wood, 83.5 x 61.4 cm, Washington D.C., National Gallery of Art.
98. Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec, *La femme au cheveux blonde*, 1894, oil on cardboard, 48 x 68 cm, Paris, Musée d'Orsay.
99. Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec, *Deux femmes demi-nues au dos*, 1894, oil on cardboard, 54 x 39 cm, Albi, Musée Toulouse-Lautrec.
100. Maurice Guibert, *Toulouse-Lautrec in his studio with one of his models*, c. 1894-6, silver paper from a silver bromide gelatin negative, 24 x 35 cm, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale.
101. A. de Montméja, "Syphilide Pigmentaire - II", from Alfred Louis Philippe Hardy and A. de Montméja, *Clinique photographique de l'hôpital Saint-Louis* (Paris, 1868).
102. A. de Montméja, "Scrofulide Erythémateuse", from Alfred Louis Philippe Hardy and A. de Montméja, *Clinique photographique de l'hôpital Saint-Louis* (Paris, 1868).
103. A. de Montméja, "Syphilide Tuberculeuse", from Alfred Louis Philippe Hardy and A. de Montméja, *Clinique photographique de l'hôpital Saint-Louis* (Paris, 1868).

104. A. de Montméja, "SyphilideVésiculaire - II", from Alfred Louis Philippe Hardy and A. de Montméja, *Clinique photographique de l'hôpital Saint-Louis* (Paris, 1868).
105. Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec, *La Toilette*, 1896, oil on cardboard, 54 x 67 cm, Paris, Musée d'Orsay.
106. Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec, *La partie des cartes*, 1891-2, oil on cardboard, private collection.
107. Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec, *Dans le lit*, 1893, oil on cardboard, 54 x 70.5 cm.
108. *Péan operating at Hôpital International*, c. 1890, engraving, Paris, Archives of the Assistance Publique.
109. Toulouse-Lautrec, "Péan - D. 3. 184", drawing, 1891-4, in M.G Dortu, *Toulouse-Lautrec et son oeuvre*, (New York, 1971).
110. Toulouse-Lautrec, "Péan - D. 3. 164", drawing, 1891-4, in M.G Dortu, *Toulouse-Lautrec et son oeuvre*, (New York, 1971).
111. Toulouse-Lautrec, "Péan - D. 3. 180", drawing, 1891-4, in M.G Dortu, *Toulouse-Lautrec et son oeuvre*, (New York, 1971).
112. Toulouse-Lautrec, "Péan - D. 3. 183", drawing, 1891-4, in M.G Dortu, *Toulouse-Lautrec et son oeuvre*, (New York, 1971).
113. Toulouse-Lautrec, "Péan - D. 3. 158", drawing, 1891-4, in M.G Dortu, *Toulouse-Lautrec et son oeuvre*, (New York, 1971).
114. Toulouse-Lautrec, "Péan - D. 3. 166", drawing, 1891-4, in M.G Dortu, *Toulouse-Lautrec et son oeuvre*, (New York, 1971).
115. Toulouse-Lautrec, "Péan - D. 3. 167", drawing, 1891-4, in M.G Dortu, *Toulouse-Lautrec et son oeuvre*, (New York, 1971).
116. Toulouse-Lautrec, "Péan - D. 3. 176", drawing, 1891-4, in M.G Dortu, *Toulouse-Lautrec et son oeuvre*, (New York, 1971).
117. Toulouse-Lautrec, "Péan - D. 3. 191", drawing, 1891-4, in M.G Dortu, *Toulouse-Lautrec et son oeuvre*, (New York, 1971).
118. Toulouse-Lautrec, "Péan - D. 3. 155", drawing, 1891-4, in M.G Dortu, *Toulouse-Lautrec et son oeuvre*, (New York, 1971).
119. Toulouse-Lautrec, "Péan - D. 3. 178", drawing, 1891-4, in M.G Dortu, *Toulouse-Lautrec et son oeuvre*, (New York, 1971).

120. Henri Gervex, *Rolla*, 1878, oil on canvas, 175 x 220 cm, Bordeaux, Musée des Beaux-Arts.
121. Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec, *Une opération par le Docteur Péan a l'Hôpital International*, 1891-2, oil on cardboard, private collection.
122. Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec, *Une opération de tracheotomie*, 1891-2, Williamstown, Massachusetts, Sterling and Francine Clark Institute.
123. Henri Gervex, *Femme au Masque*, 1886, oil on canvas, lost.
124. Detail of Gervex, *Avant l'opération*.
125. Cabanel, *Nymphe enlevée par une faune*, 1860, oil on canvas, 245 x 147 cm, private collection.
126. Cabanel, *La naissance de Vénus*, 1863, oil on canvas, 130 x 225 cm, Paris, Musée d'Orsay.
127. Bas-relief at front of the Académie de médecine, Paris.
128. *Doctor Brouardel*, marble, Paris, Académie de médecine.
129. Louis Ernest Barrias, *Nature Unveiling Herself Before Science*, 1899, marble, Paris, Académie de médecine.
130. Louis Edouard Fournier, *Louis Pasteur*, 1896, oil on canvas, Paris, École normale supérieure.
131. Eugene Delacroix, *Liberté guidant le peuple*, 1830, oil on canvas, 260 x 325 cm, Paris, Louvre.
132. *Paris Livré: les Capitulars*, postcard, 1871.
133. Edouard Manet, *Olympia*, 1865, oil on canvas, 130 x 190 cm, Paris, Musée d'Orsay.
134. Henri Gervex, *Satyre jouant avec une bacchante*, 1874, oil on canvas, 159 x 193 cm, Montluçon, Musée de Montluçon.
135. Henri Gervex, *Baigneuse endormie*, 1873, oil on canvas, 105 x 195 cm, La Rochelle, Musée des Beaux-Arts.
136. Medical Venus, eighteenth century, wax, hair, pearls, Florence, Museo del Specola.
137. Medical Venus, eighteenth century, wax, hair, Florence, Museo del Specola.

138. Advertisement for Pierre Spitzner's Grand Museum Anatomie, 1908.
139. Cartoon on occasion of Musée Grevin opening from *Moniteur Universel*, 6 June 1882.
140. Anatomical Venus that divides into 40 parts, nineteenth century (French), wax and hair, 187 x 72 x 25 cm, Spitzner collection.
141. Anatomical model of pregnant woman, nineteenth century (French or German), wax, hair, clothing and jewelry, from William Bonardo collection - now private collection.
142. Gabriel von Max, *Der Anatom*, 1868, oil on canvas, 136.5 x 189.5 cm, Munich, Neue Pinakothek.
143. Thomas Eakins, *The Gross Clinic*, 1875, oil on canvas, 243.8 x 198.1 cm, Philadelphia, Jefferson Medical College.
144. Musée des moulages at Hôpital Saint-Louis, Paris.
145. Dr. Péan's collection of moulages, Paris, Musée des moulages at Hôpital Saint-Louis.
146. Dr. Péan's collection of moulages, Paris, Musée des moulages at Hôpital Saint-Louis.
147. Edouard Dantan, *Moulage après Nature*, 1887, oil on canvas, 165 x 131.5 cm, Sweden, Göteborgs Konstmuseum.
148. Félician Rops, *La Naissance de Vénus*, 1878, tempera and gouache, Brussels, private collection.
149. Dr. Péan's collection of moulages, Paris, Musée des moulages at Hôpital Saint-Louis.
150. "Wax model of syphilitic hands and face" from J.J. Pringle, Ernest Besnier et al., *A Pictorial Atlas of Skin Diseases and Syphilitic Affections in Photolithochromes from Models in the Museum of the Saint Louis Hospital Paris*, photolithochrome, (London, 1895).
151. List of benefactors in front of the library at the Académie de médecine, Paris.
152. Moulages, Paris, Musée des moulages at Hôpital Saint-Louis.
153. Gustave Courbet, *L'Origine du Monde*, 1866, oil on canvas, 46 x 55 cm, Musée d'Orsay, Paris.

154. Moulage from Doctor Fournier's collection, Paris, Musée des moulages at Hôpital Saint-Louis.
155. Identity chart for "Une leçon clinique", from Nadine Simon-Dhouailly, *La leçon de Charcot - voyage dans une toile*, (Paris, 1985), pp. 4-5.
156. Detail of Brouillet, *Une leçon clinique*.
157. Paul Richer, "Phase des grands mouvements" and "Phase des contorsions (Arc en cercle) Plate III", from P. Richer, *L'hystéro-épilepsie ou Grande Hystérie* (Paris, 1887).
158. Paul Richer, "Contorsion - Arc en cercle" and "Contorsion", from P. Richer, *L'hystéro-épilepsie ou Grande Hystérie* (Paris, 1887), p. 81.
159. Engraving after drawings done at the Salpêtrière, "Du Somnambulisme et du Magnétisme", from Cartaz, *La Nature*, 7 December 1878, p. 104.
160. Engraving after drawings done at the Salpêtrière, "Du Somnambulisme et du Magnétisme", from Cartaz, *La Nature*, engraving, 7 December 1878, p. 105.
161. P. Richer, "D'Après un croquis fait sur nature par M. Charcot", from Charcot, *Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. I, p. 389, (Paris, 1892).
162. Loreau, "Des phénomenes d'hypnose", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, p. 175, (Paris, 1879).
163. Loreau, "Des phénomenes d'hypnose", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, p. 177, (Paris, 1879).
164. Cover of Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, (Paris, 1875).
165. After Rubens, "Esquisse de Rubens: Démoniques", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche XI, (Paris, 1877).
166. Paul Richer, "Phases of hysterical attacks", drawings, from *Études cliniques*, (Paris, 1881).
167. Paul Richer, "Représentation schématique des grands mouvements tonique", from P. Richer, *L'hystéro-épilepsie ou Grande Hystérie* (Paris, 1887), p. 51.
168. Paul Richer, "Grands mouvements", drawings, from J-M Charcot and P. Richer, *Les Démoniaques dans l'art*, (Paris, 1887).
169. Paul Richer, "Contorsion - attaque démoniaque", drawings, from J-M Charcot and P. Richer, *Les Démoniaques dans l'art*, (Paris, 1887), p. 307.

170. Reproduction of “Le Fils Possédé” from the eleventh-century manuscripts of the Emperor Otto in the cathedral of Aix-la-Chapelle, from J.-M Charcot and P. Richer, *Les Démoniaques dans l’art*, (Paris, 1887), p. 7.
171. Etching after Raphael, “Study for The Transfiguration”, (1520), from J.-M Charcot and P. Richer, *Les Démoniaques dans l’art*, (Paris, 1887), p. 29.
172. Engraving after a fresco by André del Sarte, “Saint Philippe de Néri délivrant une Possédée”, (1510), at the cloister of l’Annunziata in Florence, from J.-M Charcot and P. Richer, *Les Démoniaques dans l’art*, (Paris, 1887), p. 25.
173. Hondius engraving after Pierre Breughel, “Un groupe de danseurs de Saint-Guy”, (sixteenth century), from J.-M Charcot and P. Richer, *Les Démoniaques dans l’art*, (Paris, 1887), p. 37.
174. Engraving after Adam van Noort, “Sainte Claire délivre une dame de Pise de cinq démons”, (seventeenth century), from J.-M Charcot and P. Richer, *Les Démoniaques dans l’art*, (Paris, 1887), p. 56.
175. Engraving after B. Picart, “Grands Secours”, from *Cérémonies et contumes de tous les peuples*, (Paris, 1808), reproduced in J.-M Charcot and P. Richer, *Les Démoniaques dans l’art*, (Paris, 1887), p. 15.
176. “Pied-Bot”, engraving, from Louis Basile Carré de Montgeron, *La vérité des miracles*, (1745 - 1747), reproduced in J.-M Charcot and P. Richer, *Les Démoniaques dans l’art*, (Paris, 1887), p. 81.
177. Detail of “Grands Secours”.
178. “Léthargie”, from Bourneville and Régnard, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche XXIII, photolithograph, (Paris, 1879).
179. From Bourneville and Régnard, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, photolithograph, (Paris, 1879).
180. “Catalepsie”, from Bourneville and Régnard, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche XV, photolithograph, (Paris, 1879).
181. André Brouillet, *Le Paysan Blessé*, 1886, oil on canvas, Grenoble, Musée de Grenoble.
182. Ferdinand Gueldry, *Au laboratoire municipal*, 1887, oil on canvas, Paris, Musée Carnavalet.
183. Titian, *Danae and the golden shower*, 1545, oil on canvas, 120 x 187 cm, St. Petersburg, The Hermitage.

184. Paul Régnaud, "Attaque: Crucifiement", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche XXXVI, photolithograph, (Paris, 1878).
185. Paul Régnaud, "Hystéro-Épilepsie: Attaques", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, photograph, (Paris, 1875).
186. Tony Robert-Fleury, *Pinel, Médecin en chef de la Salpêtrière en 1795 (Pinel Freeing the Insane)*, 1876, oil on canvas, 33.4 x 41.7 cm, Paris, Hôpital Salpêtrière.
187. Paul Régnaud, "Hystéro-Épilepsie: Attaques", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, photograph, (Paris, 1875).
188. Gustave le Gray, *Nu dans l'atelier*, 1849, paper negative, 9 x 14.5 cm, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale.
189. Paul Régnaud, "Hystéro-Épilepsie: Attaques", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, photograph, (Paris, 1875).
190. Paul Régnaud, "Hystéro-Épilepsie: Attaques", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, photograph, (Paris, 1875).
191. Photograph of Freud's office, London, Freud Museum.
192. Jean-Léon Gérôme, *The Slave Auction in Rome*, c. 1884, oil on canvas, 92 x 74 cm, St. Petersburg, The Hermitage.
193. Paul Régnaud, "Hystéro-Épilepsie: Attaques", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche I, photolithograph, (Paris, 1879).
194. Paul Régnaud, "Hystéro-Épilepsie: Attaques", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche IV, photolithograph, (Paris, 1879).
195. Paul Régnaud, "Hystéro-Épilepsie: Attaques", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche II, photolithograph, (Paris, 1879).
196. Paul Régnaud, "Hystéro-Épilepsie: Attaques", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche III, photolithograph, (Paris, 1879).
197. Reproduction of Albert Londe's photograph of Charcot, from Fernand Levillain, *Charcot et l'école de la Salpêtrière*, in *Revue Encyclopédique*, no. 78, 4, March 1891, p. 113.

198. Félix Nadar, *Study for J-L Gérôme*, 1860-1.
199. Paul Régnard, "Hystéro-Épilepsie", from Bourneville and Régnard, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche XXIX, photolithograph, (Paris, 1878).
200. Paul Régnard, "Attitudes Passionnelles", from Bourneville and Régnard, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche XXI, photolithograph, (Paris, 1878).
201. Paul Régnard, "Attitudes Passionnelles", from Bourneville and Régnard, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche XXIV, photolithograph, (Paris, 1878).
202. Paul Régnard, "Atrophie cérébrale: Hémiplegie - épilepsie", from Bourneville and Régnard, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, photograph, (Paris, 1875).
203. Paul Régnard, "Hystéro-Épilepsie: Attaques", from Bourneville and Régnard, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, photograph, (Paris, 1875).
204. Paul Régnard, "Hystéro-Épilepsie: Attaques", from Bourneville and Régnard, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, photograph, (Paris, 1875).
205. Paul Régnard, "Épilepsie Partielle - contracture", from Bourneville and Régnard, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, photograph, (Paris, 1875).
206. Paul Régnard, "Épilepsie-démence épileptique", from Bourneville and Régnard, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, photograph, (Paris, 1875).
207. Paul Régnard, "Hystéro-Épilepsie: État naturel", from Bourneville and Régnard, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche XI, photolithograph, (Paris, 1879).
208. Paul Régnard, "Hystéro-Épilepsie: Physionomie normale", from Bourneville and Régnard, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche I, photograph, (Paris, 1877).
209. Paul Régnard, "Attaque Hystéro-Épileptique", from Bourneville and Régnard, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche V, photolithograph, (Paris, 1879).
210. Paul Régnard, "Somnambulisme Provoque", from Bourneville and Régnard, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche VIII, photolithograph, (Paris, 1879).
211. Paul Régnard, "Catalepsie", from Bourneville and Régnard, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche IX, photolithograph, (Paris, 1879).

212. Paul Régnaud, "Tétanisme", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche XVI, photolithograph, (Paris, 1878).
213. Paul Richer after a Régnaud photograph, from Richer, *Études cliniques*, plate II, engraving, (Paris, 1881).
214. Paul Régnaud, "Hystéro-Épilepsie: Attaques", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, photograph, (Paris, 1875).
215. Paul Régnaud, "Hystéro-Épilepsie: Hallucinations", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche XXXI, photograph, (Paris, 1877).
216. Badoureau, "Hystéro-Épilepsie", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, Figure I, drawing, (Paris, 1875).
217. Paul Régnaud, "Épilepsie Hémiplegique: Lésions trophique des os", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche VI, photolithograph, (Paris, 1878).
218. Paul Régnaud, "Atrophie cérébrale: Épilepsie partielle", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche VI, photolithograph, (Paris, 1878).
219. Paul Régnaud, "Atrophie cérébrale: Épilepsie partielle", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche V, photolithograph, (Paris, 1878).
220. Engraving after Paul Richer's drawing of deformed hands, late nineteenth century, Richer Family collection.
221. Nineteenth-century plaster cast of hysterical patient, Paris, Musée Charcot.
222. Paul Richer, "Mme. Boam, 37, Avenue de Vaugirard", ink drawing, Richer Family collection.
223. Marconi, c. 1870, photograph, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France.
224. Albert Londe, "The hands of different trades", from *La Photographie Médicale*, (Paris, 1893).
225. Paul Cruet, *Montage sur nature de la main droite d'Auguste Rodin*, 1917, plaster, Paris, Musée Rodin.
226. Photograph of Musée Charcot, c. 1878, Paris, Salpêtrière Archives.
227. Photograph of wax model from Musée Charcot in Charcot's clinical dossier, Paris, Salpêtrière Archives.

228. Nineteenth-century photograph of old hysterical woman from Musée Charcot in Charcot's clinical dossier, Paris, Salpêtrière Archives.
229. Gilbert, "Manière de déterminer le sommeil hypnotique", engraving from "Les Phénomènes d'hypnotisme", from *La Nature*, 9, 1, (Paris, 1881), p. 408.
230. Gilbert, "Autre manière de déterminer le sommeil hypnotique", engraving from "Les Phénomènes d'hypnotisme", from *La Nature*, 9, 1, (Paris, 1881), p. 408.
231. Paul Régnaud, "Hystéro-Épilepsie: État normal", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche XIV, photolithograph, (Paris, 1878).
232. Paul Régnaud, "Hystéro-Épilepsie: Attaque", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche XXXVI, photolithograph, (Paris, 1878).
233. "Des régions hystérogènes", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, (Paris, 1879).
234. Albert Londe, "Blépharospasme hystérique", from *Nouvelle Iconographie de la Salpêtrière*, photolithograph, (Paris, 1889).
235. Poyet, "Photography at the Salpêtrière", engraving, (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale).
236. Albert Londe, "Melle Mabillon, attaque hystérique", from an album from the Salpêtrière, 1882, Texbraun collection.
237. Paul Régnaud, "Attitudes Passionnelles", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche XIX, photolithograph, (Paris, 1878).
238. Paul Régnaud, "Début d'une Attaque", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche XXVIII, photolithograph, (Paris, 1878).
239. Paul Régnaud, "Attitudes Passionnelles", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche XXIII, photolithograph, (Paris, 1878).
240. Paul Régnaud, "Hystéro-Épilepsie", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche XXX, photolithograph, (Paris, 1878).
241. Archille Déveria, *Le Couché*, 1829, lithograph, 37 x 27 cm, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale.

242. Jacques-Antoine Moulin, *Le Couché*, 1853, paper negative, 21 x 15.5 cm, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale.
243. Louis Bonnard, *Study of female model*, 1881, collodion glass negative, 14 x 10 cm, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale.
244. Albert Londe, "Male Hysteric", from an album from the Salpêtrière, late nineteenth century.
245. Albert Londe, "Male Hysteric", from an album from the Salpêtrière, late nineteenth century.
246. Photograph of Charcot with patient, 1875, Paris, Hôpital Saint-Louis Archives.
247. Gilbert, engravings from "Les Phénomènes d'hypnose", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *La Nature*, 9, 2, (Paris, 1881), p. 40.
248. Gilbert, engravings from "Les Phénomènes d'hypnose", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *La Nature*, 9, 2, (Paris, 1881), p. 41.
249. Gilbert, engravings from "Les Phénomènes d'hypnose", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *La Nature*, 9, 2, (Paris, 1881), p. 409.
250. Gilbert, engravings from "La Science au Théâtre - imitation de Phénomènes d'hypnotisme à la salle Robert Houdin à Paris", W. de Fonvielle, *La Nature*, 19, 1, (Paris, 1891), p. 25.
251. Gilbert, engravings from "La Science au Théâtre - imitation de Phénomènes d'hypnotisme à la salle Robert Houdin à Paris", W. de Fonvielle, *La Nature*, 19, 1, (Paris, 1891), p. 29.
252. Richard Bergh, *La Séance d'hypnose*, 1887, oil on canvas, 153 x 195 cm, Stockholm, National Museum.
253. Paul Régnaud, "Hystéro-Épilepsie", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche XXX, photolithograph, (Paris, 1879).
254. Paul Régnaud, "Hystéro-Épilepsie: Attaques", from Bourneville and Régnaud, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, photograph, (Paris, 1875).
255. G.-B. Duchenne de Boulogne, from G.-B. Duchenne de Boulogne *De l'électrisation localisée et de son application à pathologie et à la thérapie*, photograph, (Paris, 1862).

256. G.-B. Duchenne de Boulogne, "Fig. 76", from G.-B. Duchenne de Boulogne *De l'électrisation localisée et de son application à pathologie et à la thérapie*, photograph, (Paris, 1862).
257. G.-B. Duchenne de Boulogne, "Fig. 77", from G.-B. Duchenne de Boulogne *De l'électrisation localisée et de son application à pathologie et à la thérapie*, photograph, (Paris, 1862).
258. Paul Régnard, "Lethargie", from Bourneville and Régnard, *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, planche XXXVIII, photolithograph, (Paris, 1879).
259. Gilbert, engraving from "La salle du traitement électrique à la Salpêtrière", *La Nature*, 17 October 1885, (Paris, 1885), p. 305.
260. Daniel Vierge, *Bain électrique - électrisation localisée*, 1887, gouache, 47 x 65 cm, Paris, Musée de l'Assistance Publique.
261. Daniel Vierge, *Examen d'un malade à la table d'électrothérapie, électro-diagnostic par le Dr. Vigouroux*, 1887, gouache, 47 x 65 cm, Paris, Musée de l'Assistance Publique.
262. Detail of Spitzner advertisement.

Acknowledgements

Over the course of writing this thesis, I have benefited from the encouragement and support of many people. Firstly, I would like to thank Tamar Garb for her critical readings and generous suggestions. I am grateful for the time, expertise and enthusiasm she contributed to my project. Having her as my primary advisor helped make my PhD a pleasurable process. Tom Gretton, my secondary advisor, provided imaginative insight, and I thank him for always keeping an eye out for ‘weird medical stuff’.

The research and writing of this thesis was supported by grants from the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine (Roy Porter Memorial Research Fund), the Central Research Fund of the University of London, the Royal Historical Society, the Society for the Study of French History, and both the Graduate School and History of Art Department at University College London. This funding allowed me to spend many months in Paris undertaking crucial research.

Libraries in London and Paris have provided invaluable resources. I am indebted to the librarians at the archives of the Bibliothèque Historique de la ville de Paris, the British Library, the Bibliothèque nationale de France, the Centre du Documentation at the Musée d’Orsay and the Wellcome Institute library. I am especially appreciative of the special attention and help I received at the archives at the Musée Pasteur, the Assistance Publique, the Hôpital Saint-Louis and the Salpêtrière.

During the past three years, I have presented parts of this thesis at conferences and seminars. Anthea Callen’s comments on the first draft of my chapter on Henri Gervex’s *Avant l’opération* (presented at UCL) were informative and astute. The history of medicine communities in London and abroad have graciously welcomed my research and provided vital criticism and enthusiasm. I am thankful for the audience’s responses to my ‘Work in Progress’ paper at the Wellcome Institute, my study of realistic medical images at the Joint-Atlantic Conference for the History of Medicine at Harvard, and my exploration of representations of Pasteur at the Canadian Society for the History of Medicine. A special thank you to Sander Gilman for sharing his knowledge of the history of hysteria and medical archives in France. My work also benefited from the questions and observations of the participants at the Society of Dix-Neuviémistes conference in Belfast, particularly Michael Finn, who introduced me to the work of Rachilde and enhanced my understanding of the late nineteenth-century fascination with hypnosis.

I feel fortunate to have experienced the stimulating and welcoming environment of the History of Art department at UCL. I have profited from spirited discussions and helpful dialogues with faculty and fellow students. For their camaraderie and endless supply of interesting conversation, I thank Jo Aplin, Stina Barchan, Warren Carter, Catherine Clinger, Nancy Collins, Kristen Hutchinson, Ed Krcma, Thomas Latham, Amy Mechowski, Emily Richardson, Richard Taws and Tamara Trodd. My role as editorial assistant at the Oxford Art Journal has given me the opportunity to work with many art historians who are leaders in the field. I am indebted to the editorial group for their advice and example.

Although this thesis was researched and written in London, Paris and Amsterdam, much of its driving force remained at 'home' in Canada. Thank you to Neil and Fran Macmillan for their unquestioning support. My brother, Christopher Hunter, and sister, Sarah Ecclestone, have pushed and encouraged me in ways that only older siblings can. I am especially grateful to my parents, John and Dette Hunter, whose separate specialties united and formed my interest in art history.

My greatest debt and heartfelt thanks go to Stuart Macmillan, whose patience, humour and enthusiasm have sustained me through this project from the moment of its inception.

Introduction

The 1887 Salon in Paris was considered, by the art critic Chamillac, to have caused a “virus pictural.” In his review published in *La Revue illustrée*, he constructed the Salon as a site of addiction, infection and inoculation, as well as art and culture. The worlds of art and medicine overlapped. Chamillac described the men and women leaving the Salon:

Des jeunes hommes, des vieillards, des femmes blondes ou rouges, brunes ou vertes, des gens décorés, des poètes et des négociants affolés, anémiés, donnant tous les signes du plus profond accablement sortent du Palais de l'Industrie. Courbés et atones, flageoleant sur leurs jambes veules, ils portent à grand'peine un livret rouge, signe distinctif de leur état actuel, destiné à prévenir les personnes saines d'avoir à s'éloigner d'eux au plus vite. Ces malheureux, en effet, viennent de se faire inoculer le microbe de la peinture.

Cette vaccine terrible, que certains princes de la science considèrent comme funeste, est à ce point entrée dans leur moeurs et les moelles de nos plus fiers lapins, qu'ils ne sauraient s'en passer, et que, chaque année, ils en redemandent. Cela et la morphine! Notre race y résistera-t-elle? L'avenir répondra.¹

Chamillac accompanied his text with an illustration showing frail, nauseated and even unconscious men and women leaving the Salon stumbling, as if they had just received a lethal injection (Fig. 1). Further in the article, the Salon viewers are metaphorically transformed into patients while paintings morph into infectious microbes in order to illustrate the critic's theory of Salon inoculation: unlike conventional inoculation, in which one's dosage gradually increases until the point of immunization, the Salon “patients” are forced to swallow anywhere up to 2,500 “microbes” on their first visit, receiving smaller doses until the end of Salon. For Chamillac, it was through this visual ingestion that Salon visitors were simultaneously made sick and cured. By using inoculation as a metaphor for the viewing of modern paintings, Chamillac linked the worlds of art and scientific medicine in order to question the role of both spheres in the future successes or failures of France. Could the French body endure mass inoculation? Would the “microbes” of art kill the nation or ensure its survival?

Chamillac's turn to medical metaphors is not surprising considering that three large oil paintings representing recognizable Parisian medical figures were on display at the 1887 Salon: Lucien Laurent Gsell's painting of the scientist Louis Pasteur, Henri Gervex's portrait of the surgeon Jules-Émile Péan and André Brouillet's painting of Doctor Jean-Martin Charcot at the Salpêtrière (Fig. 5, 6 & 7). Gervex and Brouillet's

¹ Chamillac, “Le Virus Pictural”, *La Revue illustrée*, I, 1887, p. 337.

paintings were two of the most popular works that year, and Gsell's portrait represented the most celebrated scientist and medical procedure in France.² The portraits of these men were often discussed together in Salon criticism as all were considered accurate representations of contemporary medical life. The portraits were understood to not only symbolize the importance of the sitters, but also the greatness of their professions.³ Pasteur, Péan and Charcot were part of the Parisian scientific and medical élite.⁴ Although Pasteur was not a medical doctor, his work on rabies vaccination and interest in human curing linked him to medicine. Péan and Charcot were known followers of scientific medicine. Péan generally followed hygienic surgical procedures that were rooted in the scientific, and Pasteurian, belief in germ theory. Although he did not wear gloves and performed surgery in formal wear, he nonetheless washed his hands and surgical instruments before operations. Charcot was also considered a proponent of scientific medicine as he was one of the most vocal supporters of Pasteur's work on rabies at the Académie de Medecine.

This thesis will focus on these paintings, as well as the three portraits of Pasteur shown the year earlier at the 1886 Salon, in order to explore the social and political uses of art and aesthetics by the medical community, and the concurrent cultural appropriation of scientific principals by artists. Although this thesis focuses on the Salon portraits of Pasteur, Péan and Charcot, each chapter expands to consider the visual representations of bodies that these men collected, commissioned and created. This broad investigation will show how the collecting of artworks and medical objects served to construct and display personal and professional identities and sexualities, as well as moral and physical states.

The first chapter examines portraits of Pasteur, including the 1886 Salon portraits by Léon Bonnat, Albert Edelfelt, and Gsell (Fig. 2, 3, 4). It will also explore representations of scientists in the popular press as well as the images and objects on display in Pasteur's home, laboratory and the Pasteur Institute. The second chapter looks

² Science, particularly during the nineteenth century, encompassed various branches of study, including medicine, engineering, chemistry, etc. As Ludmilla Jordanova has shown, the concept of a scientist is a nineteenth-century construction that came into use when laboratory research was just a small activity of those who examined the natural world. See Jordanova, *Defining Features: Scientific and Medical Portraits 1660-2000* (London, 2000), p. 13.

³ Much has been written on how the genre of portraiture was historically linked to social and economical status and authority. For a good overview, see Joanna Woodall (ed), *Portraiture: Facing the Subject* (Manchester, 1997).

⁴ Historians of medicine have been quick to point out that city medicine was very different from that practiced in rural France. Parisian doctors had a very different social position from those practicing in the countryside. For an account of this difference and histories of country medicine, see Martha L. Hildreth, *Doctors, Bureaucrats and Public Health, 1888-1902* (New York, 1987).

at Gervex's portrait of Péan. My discussion of Péan will expand to examine other paintings and sketches of the surgeon, such as those by Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec. A discussion of Péan's collection of medical waxworks will be explored in relation to paintings, photographs and wax models of unconscious and undressed young female bodies. André Brouillet's painting of Jean-Martin Charcot expounding on the hypnotized state of his hysterical female patient is the subject of the third chapter. This section will also examine the multiple representations of hysteria that Charcot commissioned in wax, plaster, photography and print, as well as visual and textual works that were influenced by his views. This investigation will move beyond traditional boundaries to consider electrotherapy, hypnosis and other medical procedures used at the Salpêtrière as modern forms of realistic representation.

The thesis begins with a discussion of the 1886 portraits of Pasteur because the Salon criticism surrounding these paintings provides a crucial introduction to late-nineteenth-century concerns regarding how professional men of science and medicine were to be portrayed.⁵ Richard Weisberg argues in his doctoral thesis on medical portraits that 1886 marked a turning point in medical and scientific portraiture because Edelfelt's portrait of Pasteur was the first painting to show a living scientist at work in a contemporary setting.⁶ Weisberg claims that prior to this painting, portraits of doctors adhered to artistic conventions of painting important and intellectual male figures in society: they were often shown well dressed and surrounded by the accoutrements of their profession but were never represented actively at work. Weisberg points out that although many major medical and scientific innovations occurred during the 1880s, including advances in anesthesiology, asepsis and vaccination, such discoveries had been happening for years beforehand and therefore could not explain this major shift in medical portraiture. He concludes that this modification was linked to the transformation of the popular image of medicine, which he sees as taking place with the widespread

⁵ Although Patricia Mainardi warns that analysing primary responses is problematic because almost anything can be proven, Salon criticism is a crucial source because its diversity points to areas of contestation while its similarities show moments of shared thought. Criticism has its own conventions and problems, but nonetheless provides nineteenth-century accounts that are important to understanding works of art and historical viewpoints. Significantly, the language used in criticism was often similar to that used in medical books. Accounts of what constituted healthy bodies, admirable morals and proper sexualities, as well as what comprised reality and objectivity, were often analogous in medical and artistic texts. Salon criticism and medical texts alike were products and producers of nineteenth-century conceptions of the body, sexuality and reality. Mainardi, *Art and Politics of the Second Empire: The Universal Expositions of 1855 and 1867* (New Haven, 1987).

⁶ Weisberg, "The Representation of Doctors at Work in Salon Art of the Early Third Republic in France", PhD dissertation, New York University, 1995, pp. 57-58.

acceptance of Pasteur's theories.⁷ Although Weisberg makes a convincing argument through a detailed look at medical genre paintings and portraits throughout the nineteenth century, his thesis does not fully acknowledge the major alterations in portraiture itself that were occurring from the mid-century, such as the fashion for creating more informal representations of sitters in their everyday environment, the desire to give portraits a sense of immediacy, as well as the interest in portraying a sitter's individuality rather than just social status.⁸ As early as 1876, Edmond Duranty called for modern portraits to show people in contemporary surroundings, in their everyday dress and in the midst of their social habits.⁹ Maurice Hamel discussed these characteristics of modern portraits when he wrote around 1889 that, "Tout en obéissant à des tendances diverses, le portrait de nos jours se fait de plus en plus soucieux de vérité intime, dédaigneux des à peu près flatteurs et des mensonges officiels. On veut voir tout l'homme et sa pensée de derrière la tête..."¹⁰ Melissa McQuillan argues in her examination of Impressionist portraits that the nineteenth-century 'breakdown' in portraiture was caused by artists' disdain for the purely commercial side of portrait making.¹¹ Meyer Schapiro and others have related the emptying of the conventions of portraiture to the rise of photographic portraiture and its availability to all classes.¹² Nineteenth-century art criticism also points to a change. As Duranty and Hamel's texts suggest, many critics wanted portraiture to provide representations of modern people that were true to life rather than artificial. The desire to document the present realistically was a key characteristic of nineteenth-century French culture, particularly as the century was drawing to a close. As Gervex reminisced in his memoirs, "...le XIXe siècle qui finissait commençait d'appeler l'attention sur cette période de notre histoire. On en remémorait les grandes dates, on en repassait les grands fait, on en peignait les grand hommes."¹³ Critics and artists wanted paintings to be

⁷ Weisberg, p. 58.

⁸ This oversight can be attributed to Weisberg's history of medicine, as opposed to history of art, approach. For an art historical account of this change, see Linda Nochlin, "Impressionist Portraits and the Construction of Modern Identity", C. Bailey (ed), *Renoir's Portraits: Impressions of an Age*, exh. cat., National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa (New Haven, 1997), pp. 53-74.

⁹ Edmond Duranty, *La Nouvelle Peinture, à propos du Groupe d'artistes qui expose dans les Galeries Durand-Ruel*, M. Guérin (ed), (Paris, 1946). This was first published as an article in Paris in 1876.

¹⁰ Maurice Hamel, "Le Portrait" in Antonin Proust, *L'art français 1789-1889* (Paris, c. 1889), p. 63.

¹¹ Melissa McQuillan, *Impressionist Portraits* (London, 1986).

¹² For examinations of the rise of photographic portraiture, see Meyer Schapiro, *Impressionism: Reflections and Perceptions* (New York, 1997), pp. 154-178, Roger Cardinal "Nadar and the Photographic Portrait in Nineteenth-Century France", Graham Clarke (ed), *The Portrait in Photography* (London, 1992), pp. 6-24, and Heather McPherson, *The Modern Portrait in Nineteenth-Century France* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 14-37.

¹³ Henri Gervex, *Souvenirs recueillis par Jules Bertaut* (Paris, 1924), p. 198.

truthful recordings of visible reality that could serve as objective historical documents for future generations. It is not surprising, therefore, that young artists, such as Edelfelt, Gsell, Gervex and Brouillet, wished to follow the current fashion and show well-known contemporary professionals at work in modern spaces.

The desire to paint medical mandarins also emerged from scientific medicine's popularity during the late nineteenth century. The successes of scientific medicine, disseminated to the public as glorified front-page news, significantly altered the ways in which the public viewed these men and their professions. By the end of the nineteenth century, medical doctors acquired a status unlike that held in any other historical period. As opposed to the 'quacks' of the past, whose prescriptions and surgeries often caused more harm than good, these 'new' doctors came to be regarded as trustworthy modern heroes. This idealisation is evident in Horace Bianchon's introduction to *Nos Grand Médecins d'aujourd'hui* of 1891: "...le médecin d'à present s'est placé tout en haut de notre échelle sociale, en un rang qu'il mérite, parce qu'il est l'un de nos grands éducateurs et l'un des dirigeants actifs de notre civilisation."¹⁴ Doctors and scientists provided new models of Republican masculinity. Their professions became associated with positive characteristics usually attributed to the male sex, such as reason, objectivity and rationality. Contemporary constructions of heroic masculinity took visual form through the depiction of dark formal attire, serious expressions and the red pin of the *Légion d'honneur*.¹⁵ Medical men were shown as figures of power and authority because they were shown hard at work and leading large crowds. They provided models of health, strength and virility from which other bodies and sexualities could be compared. Newspapers and magazines were filled with the great feats of these men. Statues of doctors and laboratory scientists were erected in front of hospitals and in public squares, and scientists and physicians increasingly occupied prominent roles in the governments of the early Third Republic.¹⁶

As is evident by the 1886 and 1887 Salon portraits and criticism, medicine also permeated sites of entertainment, leisure and commerce. Zola and Flaubert's numerous novels with medical themes, the rise of over-the-counter pharmaceuticals, Doctor Charcot's Tuesday lectures at the Salpêtrière, the 'medicalization' of spa and beauty and

¹⁴ Bianchon, p.II.

¹⁵ For a discussion of nineteenth-century constructions of masculinity see Tamar Garb, *Bodies of Modernity: Figure and Flesh in fin-de-Siècle France* (London, 1998), pp. 33-38.

¹⁶ For an examination of the role of doctors in French politics see Jack Ellis, *The Physician-Legislators of France: Medicine and Politics in the early Third Republic 1870-1914* (Cambridge, 1990).

the rise of entertainment venues showing medical objects, were all products and producers of the general public's fascination with medicine.¹⁷ Paintings and portraits with medical themes and protagonists were taken up by contemporary artists, and, like those displayed in 1886 and 1887, occupied a prominent place at the Salon during the final decades of the century.¹⁸

The popularity of portraits of medical men was also the product of social, political and economic change. The new visibility of medical men and the successes of their experiments contributed to their rise in moral, economic and social standing. As more patients survived modern medical procedures, public confidence grew. Technological advances in the fields of photography, electricity and surgical equipment, as well as newly invented ointments, vaccinations and medical treatments increased the incomes not only of scientists and doctors but of the industrial leaders and merchants involved in the trade. Science was regarded as essential to the capitalist world order of late nineteenth-century Europe. With their increase in wealth, many men attempted to secure their recently acquired social positions through the display of their newfound status. Portraits, public sculptures, political positions and public ceremonies, as well as the objects commissioned for professional collections, produced and reinforced their national importance.

Modern science and medicine were heralded as prerequisites for national salvation and were appropriated by the newly established republican governments. Scientific medicine was understood to provide France with strength and power: medicine could cure the sick, protect soldiers from infection, and increase the country's economic and intellectual strength. As is evident in Chamillac's criticism, French fears of degeneration and national weakness remained for well over a decade after the loss of the Franco-Prussian War.¹⁹ Although Chamillac described the illness provoked by Salon art, French art, like French medicine, was also associated with strength and virility. The power of art

¹⁷ For various accounts of the widespread influence of medical discourse on French culture and society, see Douglas Peter Mackaman, *Leisure Settings: Bourgeois Culture, Medicine, and the Spa in Modern France*, (Chicago, 1998), Anthea Callen, *The Spectacular Body: Science, Method and Meaning in the Work of Degas*, (London, 1995), and Lawrence Rothfield, *Vital Signs: Medical Realism in Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1994.

¹⁸ During the 1880s, genre paintings with medical themes, along with history paintings showing the great deeds of doctor's long deceased, were popular and numerous. For an account of the many paintings with medical subject matter during the 1880s Salons, see Weisberg.

¹⁹ Many scholars have addressed French anxieties after the war, particularly the fear of a declining birth rate and decrease in the number of male children. For a medical account, see Robert A. Nye, *Crime, Madness and Politics in Modern France: The Medical Concept of National Decline* (Princeton, 1984). For a discussion of the role of medicine during and after the war, see Bertrand Taithe, *Defeated Flesh: Welfare, Warfare and the Making of Modern France* (Manchester, 1999), pp. 46-96, 130-150.

and medicine were both understood as necessary for the formation of a healthy and virile French nation.²⁰ Many politicians used the newly-established social authority held by medicine as a means to express their desire to fortify the nation, bring healthcare to the public, rid hospitals of religious ruling, and eliminate the role of religious leaders in France.

In addition to examining the portraits of Pasteur, Péan and Charcot, this thesis explores primary sources surrounding the production, display and reception of medical images and objects, such as paintings, photographs, political cartoons, wax models and drawings. It investigates the ways in which men of science worked with artists in order to create realistic depictions of bodies, diseases and sexualities. By engaging in debates surrounding the representation of bodies - male and female, healthy and sick, clothed and unclothed, sentient and unconscious – this thesis considers how sex, health, race, gender and class were inscribed onto images of bodies in both medical and artistic spheres. This approach, which is built upon theoretical work in feminist art history, gender studies, discourse theory, history of medicine, theories of visual culture and theories of institutions and ideology, expands from and engages with the now widely explored understanding of the body as a socially constructed category. Although the human body is a biophysical entity, it is nonetheless formed and shaped by society, history and power.²¹ Medical discourse, as an authoritative force during the nineteenth century, formed and influenced conceptions of bodies, sexualities and diseases. Artistic circles were not oblivious to the emerging theories of modern scientific medicine nor were medical and scientific communities unaware of the power of artistic conventions. As artistic and medical training both focused on the visual examination of the human body, art and its pictorial traditions enabled medicine to visualize its normal and pathological bodies while medical ideas became embodied in artists' representations. Artists appropriated, and sought to imitate, the scientific model in order to create representations

²⁰ For examinations of the political role of art during the early Third Republic, see Miriam R. Levin, *Republican Art and Ideology in Nineteenth-Century France* (Ann Arbor, 1986), Michael R. Orwicz (ed), *Art criticism and its institutions in nineteenth-century France* (Manchester, 1994), June Ellen Hargrove and Neil McWilliam (eds), *Nationalism and French Visual Culture, 1870-1914* (New Haven, 2005), and Patricia Mainardi, *The End of the Salon: Art and the State in the Early Third Republic* (Cambridge, 1993).

²¹ The literature on the body is now extensive. Approaches to the body in relation to art and medicine include: Michel Foucault, *Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*, trans. A.M Sheridan (New York, 1975) and *History of Sexuality*, trans. Robert Hurley (London, 1979), James Elkins, *Pictures of the Body: Pain and Metamorphosis* (Stanford, 1999), Deborah Lupton, *Medicine as Culture: Illness, Disease and the Body in Western Societies* (London, 1994), Kathleen Adler and Marcia Pointon (eds), *The Body Imagined: The Human Form and Visual Culture since the Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1993) and Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, 1990).

of bodies that were considered as real and truthful as possible. Both professions worked together in the process of formulating and transforming ideas about the body through the visual image.²² By drawing on medical discourse, artists constructed bodies as deviant or normal, and therefore contributed to the discourses on regulation that permeated the public sphere through popular novels, advertising, magazines, newspapers and artwork. Conversely, medicine worked in conjunction with cultural and commercial interests to communicate ideals and standards about bodies. The increased surveillance of bodies was institutionally implemented through State apparatuses such as medicine, hygiene, law, education and the military. Yet the classification of bodies was also socially executed by the public who, armed with trickled down medical expertise and visual codes, participated in defining the limitations of bodies and behaviours.

Although this thesis engages with a visual culture approach, as it examines ‘high’ and ‘low’ forms of art, treats medical objects with the same attention as Salon paintings, considers representations in varying media, and examines both texts and images, it does not see these representations as having equal social, cultural or economic value. Rather, the *differences* between these objects, their modes of production, their cultural status, their theoretical make-up, their materiality and their historical standing are understood as essential to their meaning. These differences are also crucial factors in the construction of identities, histories and realities as each object, medium, style, theme and narrative is embedded in a socially constructed system of meaning and value.²³ This thesis is concerned with the competing claims to truth made by mediums, narratives, genres and styles, particularly those that were considered realist during the nineteenth century.

Realism is not a unified or monolithic category, nor can the discourse of realism in nineteenth-century France be seen as universal and unproblematic.²⁴ Pierre Larousse’s

²² For a discussion of the relationship between medical and artistic training, see Anthea Callen, “The Body and Difference: Anatomy training at the École des Beaux-Arts in the later nineteenth century”, *Art History*, 20,1, March 1997, pp. 23-60.

²³ The relationship between art history and visual culture has been greatly debated since the early 1990s. For various views on the uses, strengths and weaknesses of visual culture from different disciplinary perspectives, see the numerous responses to the “Visual Culture Questionnaire”, *October*, 77, Summer 1996, pp. 25-70.

²⁴ For examinations of the various and varying definitions of nineteenth-century French realism in art and literature see Linda Nochlin, *Realism* (London, 1971), Naomi Schor, *Breaking the Chain: Women, Theory and French Realist Fiction* (New York 1985), Gabriel Weisberg, *The Realist Tradition: French Painting and Drawing 1830-1900* (Indiana, 1980), James Rubin, *Realism and Social Vision in Courbet and Proudhon* (Princeton, 1980), Rothfield (1992), Peter Brooks, *Realist Vision* (New Haven, 2005), and Abigail Solomon-Godeau, “Realism Revisited” in Aruna D’Souza (ed), *Self and History: A Tribute to Linda Nochlin* (London, 2001), pp. 69-75.

Grand dictionnaire universel du XIXe siècle from 1866 began its definition of the term with:

Nous ne saurions avoir la prétention de définir exactement ce qu'il convient d'appeler réalisme, au point de vue de l'art. Le prétendu inventeur du système de peinture auquel on a donné le nom, Courbet, a déclaré ingénument, dans un manifeste publié en 1855, qu'il ne comprenait pas la signification du mot.²⁵

The lengthy entry for *réalisme* discusses the multiple styles, subject matter, theories and permutations of realist projects: realism indicated the sincere in art, the ugly in art, the immoral in art as well as the truth in art. Larousse named Carolus-Duran, Duez, Henner, Fantin-Latour and Monginot (amongst other artists whose styles vary greatly) as realists. Although his name was included in the list, Manet was described as a “réaliste excentrique”.²⁶ The diversity of realisms is evident in Larousse's definition, as adjectives and personal names were used in order to describe the different forms and types of realism. Michael Fried's studies of realism also assign different artists their own realisms, as is evident in his books *Courbet's Realism* and *Menzel's Realism*. As the titles suggest, Fried conceives realistic styles and theories as part of an artist's subjective and idiosyncratic practice even though they are related to wider representational systems and debates.²⁷ I have chosen to use the word realist, as opposed to naturalist, *just-millieu* or *pompier* to describe the works by Bonnat, Edelfelt, Gsell, Gervex and Brouillet because that was the term most used by the 1886 and 1887 Salon critics to describe these artists and their works.²⁸ Although other art historians would use the latter terms, keeping the word realist to describe the ‘modernist heroes’, Courbet and Manet, such an approach does not account for the wide-ranging definitions, understandings and approaches to realism during the nineteenth century. Furthermore, realism was not a static term: by the end of the nineteenth century, the realisms of Courbet and Manet (which were primarily

²⁵ Pierre Larousse, *Grand dictionnaire universel du XIXe siècle*, (Paris, 1866), p. 755.

²⁶ Larousse, p. 757.

²⁷ Michael Fried, *Courbet's Realism* (Chicago, 1990) and *Menzel's Realism: Art and Embodiment in Nineteenth-Century Berlin* (New Haven, 2002).

²⁸ Although naturalism was also used to describe these works, the difference between realism and naturalism was dependent upon the critic. In Larousse, naturalism was described simply as realism. Although some twentieth-century scholars have understood naturalism as a more positivist and scientific form of realism, most current discussions of realism and naturalism consider them as the same thing. As James Elkins has simply stated, both should be understood “indifferently as the practice of making pictures that are said to resemble what they denote.” Elkins, *On Pictures and the Words that Fail Them* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 48.

understood as revolutionary and avant-garde during the mid-century) came to represent a semi-official style of the republican governments of the early Third Republic.²⁹

Artists learned how to create realistic representations through different formal strategies and mediums. The juxtaposition of different brushwork, the use of shadows and highlights, the application of perspective and the mixing of pigments to form life-like colours all allowed artists to produce images of reality. Yet as Roland Barthes claims in his essay, "The Reality Effect", these elements all signify the real but are not reality. Although a realist sign attempts to efface itself in order to create an illusion of the real, it can never *be* reality. For Barthes, realism can only be a part of the real.³⁰ James Elkins has also questioned the claims to reality made by painterly marks by arguing that we should not consider these realist techniques as a simple "alphabet of realism", but must recognize that pictorial elements are both semiotic and non-semiotic.³¹ An image's degree of realism and claim to truth is not historically secure as people from different cultures and historical periods read reality in different ways. As Nelson Goodman has argued, "realism is relative" as it is dependent upon the representational systems of particular places, societies and times.³² New technologies of vision also altered the ways in which the real was understood and constructed.³³ This is particularly evident with the invention of photography as it redefined reality and what was considered realistic.

Photography was instilled with a claim to reality because of the believed technological sincerity of the camera itself, which was understood as a mechanism of truth. Its use within medical, scientific and legal spheres further imbued photography with its claim to truth and neutrality. The introduction of the first edition of *Revue Photographique des hôpitaux de Paris* of 1869 describes the characteristics and use of photography as "Un mode d'illustration, tout à fait nouveau, nous permet de joindre à cette Revue des planches dont la vérité est toujours supérieure à celle de tout autre genre

²⁹ For accounts of how the history of artists' practice was rewritten to fulfill political aims see Michael R. Orwicz (ed), *Art Criticism and its Institutions in Nineteenth-Century France* (Manchester, 1994), particularly Linda Nochlin, "The depoliticization of Gustave Courbet: Transformation and Rehabilitation under the Third Republic", pp. 109-119 and Michael R. Orwicz, "Reinventing Édouard Manet: Rewriting the Face of National Art in the early Third Republic", pp. 122-145.

³⁰ Roland Barthes, "Reality Effect", trans. R. Carter, *French Literary Theory Today: A Reader* (Cambridge, 1982), pp. 11-17.

³¹ Elkins (1998), p.58.

³² Nelson Goodman, *Languages of Art: An approach to a Theory of Symbols* (Indianapolis, 1976), p. 37.

³³ Jonathan Crary discusses the ways in which different apparatuses of sight altered the ways in which people understood the world in his book, *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1990).

d'iconographie."³⁴ Albert Londe, head of photography at the Salpêtrière, stressed the sincerity of photography when he wrote:

Le première de ces qualités, c'est la sincérité, l'exactitude de la reproduction. Quelle que soit la complication d'un objet, rien n'est plus simple maintenant que d'en obtenir la reproduction absolument fidèle. Ici pas d'interprétation possible.³⁵

Photography was understood as a means of documentation, its speed and precision offering a new form of representation that could not be achieved by other media. Yet photography was not unquestionably accepted as purely objective and socially responsible. Its close ties to pornography and debates surrounding its status as Art certainly questioned the assumed neutrality of the medium.³⁶ When Londe wrote in his 1888 book *La Photographie Moderne – Pratique et Application* that photography “n'est qu'une copiste fidèle, rigoureusement exacte,”³⁷ he also prefaced his discussion of photography with the claim that:

La photographie est loin d'être purement une écriture, mécanique et impersonnelle: ce qui le prouve le mieux c'est qu'un connoisseur sait dire l'auteur de telle ou telle épreuve, tant il est vrai que celui-ci, s'il est homme de coeur, a pu imprimer à son oeuvre son cachet personnel.³⁸

Although Londe may appear to contradict himself several times in the text, as photography's claim to objectivity and neutrality is frequently stated and praised, his introductory remarks reveal the underlying tensions that existed in nineteenth-century understandings of photography, particularly for someone like Londe who was interested not only in photography's documentary role in scientific medicine, but also in photography's technological, documentary and artistic functions.³⁹

Despite the many differences in formal and technological strategies between photography, paint and other modes of representation, images and objects were described as realistic when they were seen to imitate the visible world. Although some critics and artists believed that images could make greater claims to reality by being filtered through an artist's subjective experience (while others thought art should strive to be purely

³⁴ A. de Montméja, *Revue Photographique des hopitaux de Paris*, Paris, 1869.

³⁵ Albert Londe, *La Photographie Médicale* (Paris, 1892), p. 310.

³⁶ For an exploration of the role of photography during the nineteenth century through an examination of primary sources, see André Rouillé, *L'empire de la photographie: photographie et pouvoir bourgeois, 1839-1870* (Paris, 1982).

³⁷ Albert Londe, *La Photographie Moderne – Pratique et Application*, (Paris, 1888), p. 157.

³⁸ Londe (1888), p. 4.

³⁹ For further information on Londe's interests, see *La Photographie Moderne, La Photographie Instantanée – Théorie et Pratique* (Paris, 1897) and Denis Bernard and André Gunthert, *L'instant rêvé Albert Londe*, (Nîmes, 1993).

objective and detached), both turned to the scientific model in order to find a language with which to produce the real.

Beginning in the mid-century, many theorists and artists admired and sought to imitate the scientific model which, through its focus on direct and documented visual observation, was understood as confining itself to the date of experience, and excluding *a priori* speculation in its quest for truth. This empiricist approach to truth was supported by the conviction that scientific theories were proved objectively true or false by their correspondence, or failure to correspond, to an independently existing reality. Artists used science as a model for truth claims. The Goncourt brothers wrote in 1860 that, “The true is the basis of all art; it is its foundation and its conscience,”⁴⁰ Jules Castagnary claimed in 1863 that naturalist art was “truth bringing itself into equilibrium with science,”⁴¹ and Pierre-Joseph Prudhon argued in 1865 that “art cannot subsist apart from truth and justice; science and morality are its leading lights...”⁴² The successes of contemporary scientific endeavors, such as Pasteur’s work on rabies vaccination, and accordingly, the power and authority granted to the scientific model, continued to be desired and appropriated by many in the art world towards the end of the century.⁴³ Paul Lenoir wrote in his 1889 book on the history of realism that, “La vérité, la réalité, la nature, sont le terrain commun où ces expressions diverses du sentiment humain doivent coexister. De leur alliance ce composent les chef-d’oeuvres”⁴⁴ and that, “La Science, tel est le dernier mot de nos aspirations actuelles. La Science porte en elle le fait, la réalité, la vérité et l’immensité de l’infini.”⁴⁵ For artists and writers, like Lenoir, such an alliance could provide Art with its greatest successes. Science was seen to provide art with an authoritative model by which to claim mastery over the realm of the objective and truthful, while, increasingly, art showed it could provide science with a visual language and aesthetic conventions. In turn, the moral virtues attributed to science – honesty, sincerity and authenticity – took visual form in the aesthetic of realist practice. Realist

⁴⁰ Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, “Journal, 10 December 1860” as translated in Charles Harrison and Paul Wood *Art in Theory, 1815-1900* (Oxford, 1998), p. 417.

⁴¹ Jules Castagnary, Salon review of 1863, as cited in Nochlin (1971), p. 42.

⁴² Pierre-Joseph Proudon, “Du Principe de l’art et sa destination social”, 1865, as cited in *Art in Theory*, p. 405.

⁴³ For accounts of nineteenth-century medical progress in France, see Ann LaBerge and Mordecai Feingold (eds), *French Medical Cultures in the Nineteenth Century* (Amsterdam, 1994), André R. Aisenberg, *Contagion: Disease, Government and the ‘Social Question’ in Nineteenth-Century France* (Stanford, 1999), and Robert Fox and George Weisz (eds), *The Organization of Science and Technology in France 1808-1914* (Cambridge, 1980).

⁴⁴ Paul Lenoir, *Histoire du Réalisme et du Naturalisme dans la poésie et dans l’art depuis l’antiquité jusqu’à nos jours* (Paris, 1889), p. I.

⁴⁵ Lenoir, p. 759.

formal strategies were thus subtly imbued with neutrality and objectivity whilst other styles were consigned to the realm of the imaginary, the fantastical and the unreal. Realist techniques were applied to scientific subject matter because such themes were thought to require what was believed to be the most technological and impartial of styles.

Although realism was often propagated as a metaphor of rationality and neutrality, I will argue that realist aesthetic strategies are no more objective than any other artistic practices; all styles are intricately bound to professional, institutional, cultural, political and personal imperatives. In her now canonical text of 1971, *Realism*, Linda Nochlin discusses the construction and myth of realism as the “styleless style”.⁴⁶ Nochlin justly argues that despite realist claims to provide impartial representation of the world, based on scrupulous inspection of contemporary life, realist practice was no more a mirror image of visual reality than any other artistic movement or stylistic phenomenon.⁴⁷ By simply assuming that representations are true because of the mimetic capacities of art to stand in as reflections of reality, the powerful influences of convention and history, as well as conscious and unconscious intentions and aspirations, be those institutional, individual or societal, are ignored. The assumed readability and verity of realistic representations construct them as neutral and documentary rather than as subjective and historically implicated. Despite the claims to reality made by the optical details of certain materials and procedures, as well as the cultural associations drawn between the assumed sincerity of modern science and realist works during the nineteenth century, the ‘reality effect’ was nonetheless constructed by strokes of paint, coloured pigments, photographic chemicals, malleable wax and other mediums and techniques. Formal conventions produced this effect as perspectival norms created by painterly lines and marks were regarded as neutral visions of the world, and black and white photography was praised for its all encompassing details despite its lack of colour. The mis-en-scènes of realist paintings were permeated by representational conventions, particularly since the events depicted were often staged in studios. As Peter Brooks has pointed out, realism is a “form of play that uses carefully wrought and detailed toys” in order to reproduce “the look and feel of the real thing.”⁴⁸

Theories of mimesis have often been used to discuss imitations of the visible world in the disciplines of art and literature. Erich Auerbach’s influential work, *Mimesis*:

⁴⁶ Linda Nochlin, *Realism* (London, 1971), pp. 14-17.

⁴⁷ Nochlin (1971), p. 13.

⁴⁸ Peter Brooks, *Realist Vision* (New Haven, 2005), p. 3

The Representation of Reality in Western Literature, published in German in 1946 and translated into English in 1953, provides a cohesive account of literary realism across a broad historical period by exploring the continuities and breaks in realist practices. By studying the changing conception of reality in literary works, Auerbach points out how realism can be seen to signify social reality. Theories of mimesis, such as Auerbach's, alert us to the codified representational systems through which the world is filtered. They also show how the ideologies of realisms - far from being purely neutral and descriptive - are inflected by social processes and attitudes. Gunter Gebauer and Christoph Wulf have argued that the history of mimesis is "a history of disputes over the power to make symbolic worlds, that is, the power to represent the self and others and interpret the world."⁴⁹ By focusing on mimesis in terms of power, they provide a model of mimesis that is not concerned with the traditional boundaries that are drawn between art and science. Rather, they explore mimetic processes as those that allow for the entanglement of art, science, literature, philosophy and aesthetics, seeing these links as the productive side of mimesis. Instead of working within a strict concept of mimesis, as constructed by any one thinker, I want to take advantage of the flexibility of the concept itself, drawing on what Christopher Prendergast has referred to as the "inherent conceptual ambiguity" of mimesis.⁵⁰ By focusing on realism's correspondence with other discourses of verisimilitude, particularly those of modern scientific medicine and art, I will explore the processes of inclusion and exclusion that are integral to this correspondence, and subsequently, to the ways in which this process creates meaning. As Lawrence R. Schehr has argued, the interruptions in realism's ability to represent should not be regarded as realism's failure but as integral to the realist project.⁵¹ Correspondingly, Arne Melberg has claimed that mimesis should never be understood as a homogeneous term, for although mimesis is linked to similarity, it is always open to the opposite.⁵² For Melberg, mimesis is a "meeting-place" for opposing forces: proximity and distance, presence and absence, similarity and difference.

This thesis will not provide a historiography of realism, nor an in depth critique of its diverse and numerous philosophical constructions. Rather, it will explore the permutations and modifications of realist projects as they corresponded with one of the

⁴⁹ Gunter Gebauer and Christoph Wulf, *Mimesis: Culture, Art, Society* (Berkeley, 1995), p. 3.

⁵⁰ Christopher Prendergast, *The Order of Mimesis: Balzac, Stendhal, Nerval, Flaubert* (Cambridge, 1986), p. 5.

⁵¹ Lawrence R. Schehr, *Rendering French Realism*, (Stanford, 1997), pp. 17-18.

⁵² Arne Melberg, *Theories of Mimesis: Literature, Culture, Theory* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 2.

other main authoritative discourses of verisimilitude during the nineteenth century, that of science, of which medicine is a component.⁵³ By drawing on various conceptions of realism in nineteenth-century French medical and artistic discourses, I will explore the characteristics, intricacies and troubles of realistic representations. I will look at how realisms competed, merged and converged in the construction of reality as an image's or object's degree of realism was dependant on cultural, historical, literary, artistic and scientific notions of what constituted 'reality'. As Nicholas Green has argued, there is a problem not only with the belief that "some modes of discourse *can* approximate the 'real' but that there is a real – out there – to be approximated."⁵⁴ Visual and textual conventions, such as descriptive prose, detailed brushwork and professional affiliations (particularly modern scientific medicine's cultural association with truth), produced 'reality' through historically specific codes that signified reality to nineteenth-century audiences. Yet the manufacturing of the 'reality effect' was often done covertly, as codes were naturalized and often invisible.

Medical professionals sought to make sense of the world by cataloguing, creating and collecting life-like representations of bodies. Realistic images and objects were seen to attest to the truthfulness of their discoveries and inventions, as well as strengthen their claims to the reality of diseases and diagnoses. Yet as Georges Didi-Huberman has shown, the assembling and cataloguing of collections involves preconceiving and fabricating reality as the knowledge constructed through collecting practices becomes aligned with truth.⁵⁵ The medical establishment's need to both produce and authenticate reality by creating and collecting realistic renderings of bodies - as well as the subjective fantasies involved in amassing objects for personal ownership – point to a desire for the real that undermines the claims to truth and objectivity assigned to the collected medical objects. While these images and objects served to portray personal and professional identities as rational and reasonable, they also fulfilled personal and professional desires that could be seen to exceed the necessities of scientific duty.⁵⁶ As Jonathan Crary has

⁵³ For a discussion of realism in relation to other discourses of verisimilitude, such as science, philosophy and history, see Schehr. For an account of the historical differences between the categories of Science and Medicine, see Jordanova (2000), pp. 61-66.

⁵⁴ Nicholas Green, *The Spectacle of Nature: Landscape and Bourgeois Culture in Nineteenth-Century France* (Manchester, 1990), p. 2.

⁵⁵ Georges Didi-Huberman, *Confronting Images: Questioning the Ends of a Certain History of Art* (Pennsylvania, 2005), pp. 71-72.

⁵⁶ For various discussions of the irrational and hidden motives of collecting practices, see Michael Camille and Adrian Rifkin (eds), *Other Objects of Desire: Collectors and Collecting Queerly* (Oxford, 2001).

suggested in his discussion of the overlapping figure of collector, detective, consumer and fetishist, there is a perversion at the core of the search for fact and truth.⁵⁷

The overlapping of spheres and identities is also evident in Chamillac's Salon review, which began this introduction. In his text, paintings become microbes, Salon viewers morph into patients, and looking at art turns into a modern medical procedure. Such metaphors point to the overlapping figures of doctor and artist. Both artists and doctors believed one could know the world through acute observation and meticulous documentation. Both shared the desire to represent bodies as realistically as possible. Artists took on the role of men of science: they studied their sitters, examined the environment in which they lived, and portrayed their every inch with great detail and microscopic likeness. Similarly, doctors and scientists turned to the visual arts in order to create and commission realistic representations of bodies for their own personal and professional gain, knowledge and delight. Both professions used powers of observation and relied on the ocular. The close links drawn between art and scientific medicine are not surprising. After all, Pasteur, Péan and Charcot all widely expressed the same certainty in the popular press: if they had not become men of science, they would have become artists.

⁵⁷ See Crary's discussion of Max Klinger's glove cycle in *Suspensions of Perception: Attention, Spectacle and Modern Culture* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 90-134.

The Making of a Scientific Hero: Portraiture and Louis Pasteur

Three portraits of Louis Pasteur were on display at the 1886 Salon in Paris. Léon Bonnat represented Pasteur with his granddaughter, Albert Edelfelt painted Pasteur working on a scientific experiment, and Laurent Lucien Gsell depicted Pasteur and his colleagues in a messy laboratory. The 1886 portraits, and the accompanying Salon criticism, represent a moment in which the practice of depicting modern professional men of science was being debated, defined and created.

This chapter will concentrate on the multiple portrayals of Louis Pasteur that saturated French society during the late-nineteenth century by considering the ways in which representations of Pasteur, particularly those on display at the 1886 Salon, constructed modern male professionalism and masculinity in scientific spheres and, in turn, how these portraits served as templates for the representation of medical men at the next year's Salon. The 1886 Salon portraits of Pasteur provided referents for how to paint professional men as Salon reviews gave accounts of critics' views as to how such men should be portrayed. The attention paid to the 1886 portraits in Salon criticism contributed to the popularity of portraits of scientists and doctors the following year. Henri Gervex's *Avant l'opération*, André Brouillet's *Une leçon clinique la Salpêtrière* and Laurent Gsell's *La vaccine de la rage au laboratoire de M. Pasteur*, all exhibited at the 1887 Salon, have marked similarity: each is a large oil portrait of a professional man of science, in his workplace, addressing an audience while in the process of 'curing' patients.⁵⁸ Unlike the 1887 portraits, those on display in 1886 were very different from one another. Significantly, Gsell's small 1886 portrait of Pasteur, which was overlooked in the majority of Salon criticism, differed greatly from the larger canvas he was to exhibit in 1887.

The emergence of new professions and professional spaces demanded that portraiture adjust to account for modern men and their work places. The prominence and influence of scientists was ever-present in modern Paris. This rise became linked to the genre of portraiture as painted portraits, large scale sculptures and photographic

⁵⁸ In early editions of the 1887 Salon catalogue, Gsell's painting was mislabeled *Le premier septembre*. Paul Leroi, "Salon de 1887", *L'Art*, 42, 1887, p. 209.

portrayals of doctors and scientists filled the papers, Salons and public squares, thus propagating and contributing to the 'essential' role of science in the progress and safety of France. The multiple images and articles about scientific discoveries and professionals in newspapers, the increase in specialist journals dedicated to science and medicine, the multiple books published that provided photographs and biographical notes on prominent scientists, and the emergence of portraits of scientists and doctors at the annual Salons are evidence of the ways in which these seemingly anonymous and universal representations not only became a part of everyday life but helped form and shape it.

By examining how Pasteurian iconography simultaneously constructed Pasteur as a national hero, a loving family man, a 'mad scientist' as well as a symbol of the humanitarian and international successes of modern medicine, this chapter will explore how realistic portraiture both naturalized and problematized the social, historical, and economic positions of men associated with experimental laboratory science and modern medicine. It will also consider Pasteur's role in forming public conceptions of the chemist, his institute and the most popular of his discoveries, the vaccine for rabies.

Portraiture at the 1886 Salon

Portraiture was the *genre du jour* at the 1886 Salon. As Georges Lafenestre wrote in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, "Les tableaux d'histoire sont rares au Salon de 1886; les études de nu, sauf quelques exceptions, y restent médiocres; le portrait seul y domine par la qualité comme par le nombre."⁵⁹ The importance and public fascination with portraiture was rooted in the belief that it contributed to the superiority of French art. Alfred de Lostalot wrote in his review in the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* that:

Ce n'est pas sans raison que je place le Portrait en tête de cette rapide étude. Le portrait est ce que nous avons de mieux en France, pour le moment, dans la peinture proprement dite. D'excellents artistes en ont fait leur spécialité...la peinture de portrait a une tenue, au Salon, que l'on chercherait vainement dans les autres genres. Comme il s'agit de l'honneur de l'Ecole Française, nous sommes heureux de constater que cette gloire traditionnelle du portrait ne semble pas menacer de déchoir dans les mains des artistes contemporains.⁶⁰

Portraiture was also a means through which prominent French individuals, such as Pasteur, could be publicly displayed and celebrated. French national pride was compounded in portraiture as it linked the pre-eminence of French art and Frenchmen.

⁵⁹ Georges Lafenestre, "Le Salon", *Revue des Deux Mondes*, May-June 1886, p. 590.

⁶⁰ Alfred de Lostalot, "Le Salon de 1886: La Peinture", *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, Paris, 1886, p. 456.

During the late 1870s, portraiture was beginning to be understood as the ‘new’ history painting. Arsène Houssaye redefined history painting in his review of the 1877 Salon, linking painters who portrayed modern men in modern times with the ‘great’ French history painters such as Poussin and David.⁶¹ Portraits were beginning to be understood as historical documents that accurately recorded modern life for future viewers. As a genre with strong historical links to royalty and aristocracy, portraiture transferred its historical status and authority onto its sitters, thus providing modern professions and professionals with social, cultural and historical legitimacy. Although portraiture was regarded as a relatively insignificant category at the École des Beaux-Arts during the nineteenth century (it was not included in artists’ training), portraiture, as commissioned work, allowed artists to display the greatness of their sitters, exhibit their own painterly talents and provided them with relatively stable incomes.⁶²

Portraiture’s popularity at the Salons also stemmed from the public’s fascination with celebrity. The life-sized and life-like portraits exhibited at the Salons stood in for the sitter, providing a surrogate body at which the public could gaze, thus giving them access to a public figure to whom they would most likely have been denied contact. Louis Ganderax argued in his article in *La République Française* that the popularity of the person portrayed often overshadowed a portrait’s aesthetic worth. He claimed that the Salon viewer:

...s’occupe plus volontiers de savoir qui est le modèle d’un portrait que d’en juger la valeur. S’il fallait juger de la popularité des personnages par l’empressement qu’apportent les beaux-arts à reproduire leur traits, on devrait supposer, sans parler des morts (car les hommages à Victor Hugo abondent dans les galeries hautes aussi bien qu’au jardin), que les contemporains prééminants sont; M. Pasteur, qui a deux portraits en pied, l’un comme grand-père et l’autre comme cultivateur de virus... Les portraits de personnages connus de tout genre abondent et peuvent satisfaire bien de curiosité.⁶³

The commemoration of French men, and Pasteur in particular, was also noted by George Olmer, who wrote in his book on the 1886 Salon that:

Comme la Revue annuelle de Variétés, le Salon sacrifie aux actualités et brûle toujours un peu d’encens en l’honneur des hommes du jour. Nous nous attendions

⁶¹ Arsène Houssaye “Le Salon de 1877”, *L’Artiste*, June 1877, p. 420.

⁶² For general discussions of portraiture in nineteenth-century France, see Heather McPherson, *The Modern Portrait in Nineteenth-Century France* (Cambridge, 2001), Melissa McQuillan, *Impressionist Portraits* (London, 1986) and Pierre Vaisse, “Between Convention and Innovation: the Portrait in France in the Nineteenth Century” in Félix Baumann, Maurianne Karabelnik and Jean Sutherland Boggs (eds), *Degas Portraits* (London, 1994), pp. 118-127.

⁶³ Louis Ganderax, “Causerie sur le Salon”, *La République Française*, 2 Mai 1886.

donc à y voir figurer un portrait de M. Pasteur; nous en avons deux, et nous sommes loin de nous en plaindre, car l'hommage artistique rendu au grand savant ne saurait être trop éclatant.⁶⁴

That numerous paintings of Pasteur filled the Salon is not surprising. Pasteur was well-known in France for the promotion of the germ theory which argued against the concept of spontaneous generation, his successful treatment of the silkworm blight, and his highly publicized discoveries of vaccines against chicken cholera and anthrax. Pasteur's most celebrated success, and subsequent controversy, arose from his discovery of a vaccination for rabies in July 1885.⁶⁵ For the following two years newspapers and magazines were filled with debates surrounding Pasteur and rabies, the majority of which were positive. As exemplified by an article in *Le Soir*, Pasteur's discoveries lead to him being described as, "Un vrai grand homme, acclamé par toutes les élites du pays, un savant français, salué par tous les représentants des grandes puissances, un illustre, modeste dans sa gloire..."⁶⁶ The public's familiarity with Pasteur and his work is evident in Adrien Marx's article published in *Le Figaro* which claimed that, "Son [Pasteur's] portrait et son oeuvre sont universellement connus. La photographie, le pinceau et la plume ont reproduit ses traits, raconté sa vie et publié ses labeurs."⁶⁷

The 1886 Salon portraits were particularly important because they were the first painted portraits of Pasteur to be exhibited to the Parisian public after his discovery of a vaccine for rabies. These portraits, therefore, displayed more than just Pasteur's status as a prominent individual in Parisian society. They came to symbolize the safety and dangers of new scientific discoveries involving humans, the rising social, economic and cultural status of scientific professions and professionals, the integration of laboratory science into medical practice, and the crucial role of science in the progress and security of France. Portraiture functioned as an ideal tool for professional and personal propaganda by simultaneously drawing on the cultural authority of past conventions while exhibiting subjects of the utmost modernity.

⁶⁴ Georges Olmer, *Salon de 1886* (Paris, 1886), p. 76.

⁶⁵ Many histories have been written on Pasteur and his discoveries. The main primary sources are René Valléry-Radot, *Pasteur, histoire d'un savant par un ignorant* (Paris, 1883) and *La vie de Pasteur* (Paris, 1900). The most thorough secondary sources are: Gerald L. Geison, *The Private Life of Louis Pasteur* (Princeton, 1995), Bruno Latour, *The Pasteurization of France* (Cambridge, 1988), René Dubos, *Pasteur and Modern Science* (Madison, 1988) and Patrice Debré, *Louis Pasteur* (Baltimore, 1998).

⁶⁶ "Inauguration de l'Institut Pasteur", *Le Soir*, 19 November 1888, n.p.

⁶⁷ Adrien Marx, "M. Pasteur et le Docteur Peter", *Le Figaro*, 23 January 1887, n.p.

Men at Work: Realism and Portraiture

Although there were three portraits of Pasteur on show in 1886, those by Bonnat and Edelfelt received the most attention. Gsell's portrait was rarely discussed in Salon criticism. This is not surprising, considering that those that did mention the painting claimed it was too small, hung too high, and was therefore hard to see. As described in *Le journal des arts*, Gsell's painting was a "petit toile dans les tons gris, placée trop haut pour qu'on puisse bien saisir les détails qui semblent très juste."⁶⁸ This may explain why he went for a larger horizontal format the following year. The majority of Salon criticism concentrated on Bonnat and Edelfelt's paintings, comparing them to one another. Critics positioned Edelfelt's rendering of Pasteur as a scientist in his laboratory against Bonnat's portrayal, which showed the chemist as a grand-father and recipient of the *légion d'honneur*. The ways in which the two artists chose to paint Pasteur, and which of the two paintings would become *the* historical portrait of the scientist, was greatly debated. Georges Olmer praised Edelfelt's portrait, claiming that, "Ce portrait est complet. Il dit l'homme et le labour de sa vie, et il pourrait bien être le portrait définitif de M. Pasteur."⁶⁹ In contrast, Lafenestre dismissed Edelfelt's painting, writing that, "Le portrait de M. Bonnat est l'image historique; celui de M. Edelfelt n'est qu'une image anecdotique."⁷⁰ The main difference noted by critics was the different settings in which Pasteur was depicted.

Edelfelt painted Pasteur in his laboratory, surrounded by the accoutrements of modern science. As is evident in a letter that the artist wrote to his mother, Edelfelt believed that this was the only way one could represent Pasteur:

Lundi prochain, j'irai à nouveau chez le vieux Pasteur pour voir s'il y a une possibilité de faire son portrait dans le laboratoire, parce que c'est seulement là, dans cet environnement, que je veux le peindre. Le vieux Pasteur en habit noir avec ses décorations, c'est un peu ridicule. Non, c'est dans son élément qu'il doit être: les lunettes sur le nez, la calotte sur la tête et le microscope devant lui.⁷¹

Edelfelt's letter reveals a dislike for official portraits that removed modern man from his environment. For Edelfelt, painting Pasteur in his laboratory next to a microscope, adorned with glasses and a scull cap, was key to the portrait's success. Edelfelt's views paralleled those of many contemporary critics and artists who stressed that portraiture

⁶⁸ Aug. Dalligny, "Le Salon de Peinture", *Le journal des arts*, 11 May 1886.

⁶⁹ Olmer, p.76.

⁷⁰ Lafenestre (1886), p.581.

⁷¹ Letter from Edelfelt to his mother, 18 April 1885, cited in Association Arbois-Pasteur, *Rappelez-Vous l'Arboisien – Pasteur, l'Artiste et Ses Amis Aristes*, (Arbois, 1995), p. 50.

needed to provide representations that were as lifelike as possible, and that an accurate depiction of the sitter's environment was essential for portraying a sitter's identity and inner being. They praised portraits that provided realistic portrayals of sitters in modern spaces, surrounded by the objects of modern life. As Olmer wrote:

La vérité! On la veut tout entière aujourd'hui. Il faut qu'elle se montre, il faut qu'elle parle...On attend du peintre qu'il transporte à domicile, qu'il apprenne à connaître non seulement la figure qu'il doit peindre, mais le milieu où cette figure se meut naturellement. Le portrait se développe, il embrasse l'homme et sa vie. Il exige pour accessoires les instruments de sa gloire et de sa fortune, où tout au moins les meubles familiers, qui trahissent les mœurs du personnage représenté, ses objets préférés, devenus, par une chère habitude, des parties intégrantes de son être.⁷²

The sitter's identity was not only displayed through a visibly accurate portrayal of the physical body, but the portrait's setting and accessories contributed to the sitter's character. The degree to which a painting was understood as an exact representation was not only achieved through a lifelike rendering but through the depiction of the world in which the sitter lived and worked. Showing men at work contributed to the 'reality' of the image even though such renditions were as staged and preconceived as traditional portraits. People were defined by the spaces they inhabited and by the objects that surrounded them. Linda Nochlin had argued that mid-nineteenth century vanguard painters, such as Edouard Manet, constructed modern identities through an emphasis on surface detail.⁷³ As evidenced by Manet's widely discussed portrait of Zola of 1868, the identities of both writer and artist are formed by the objects that Manet depicted around Zola, such as the assortment of well-chosen books, which includes Zola's published defence of Manet's *Olympia* (Fig. 8). The importance placed on surface details and the inclusion of objects pertaining to the sitter's identity in Manet's portraits influenced many artists, such as Edelfelt, who saw Manet's painting of Zola at a portrait exhibition in 1883.⁷⁴ Following Manet, Edelfelt surrounded his sitter with specific props: a microscope, glass pipettes, hand-written notes and science books. By depicting Pasteur with his arm propped up on a thick hardback, one hand holding sheets of paper, the other hand gently supporting a glass tube, Edelfelt portrayed him as the embodiment of scientific progress and potential: Pasteur's scientific knowledge is symbolized by the

⁷² Olmer, p. 76.

⁷³ Linda Nochlin, "Impressionist Portraits and the Construction of Modern Identity", Colin Bailey, et al., *Renoir's Portraits: Impressions of an Age*, p. 66.

⁷⁴ *L'horizon inconnu: L'art du Finlande 1870-1920*, ex.cat. Musées de Strasbourg, Galerie de l'Ancienne douane (Strasbourg, 1999).

excessively thick book, his belief in experimental science is denoted by the glass tubes and equipment, while his individual ‘genius’ is indicated by hand-held notes, acute observation, solidarity and the single portrait itself. The props of science depicted by Edelfelt are similar to those used in earlier portraits of scientists and medical men, such as in Joshua Reynolds’s portrait of the pioneering surgeon John Hunter of 1788, where books and anatomical models are used to indicate scholarly scientific pursuits (Fig. 9). Yet Edelfelt’s portrait differs from these older models because Pasteur is shown working rather than merely posing.⁷⁵ Enveloped by the laboratory and surrounded by experimental tools, Pasteur is represented as being in control of science: only through his mind do the curative powers of science become articulated. The casual stance of his leaning body and his dominant position in the canvas emphasize his role, and comfort, as a scientific leader.

Although Edelfelt painted Pasteur without his official decorations, he replaced these indicators of status and authority through Pasteur’s depiction in the laboratory. As is evident in a poem written for Pasteur by Eugène Manuel and read publicly at a soirée celebrating Pasteur at the Trocadero on 11 May 1886, Pasteur’s identity was intricately linked to the laboratory:

Où donc est sa grandeur? Où se fait son histoire?
 -Elle se fait là-bas, dans ce laboratoire,
 Où l’univers est suspendu;
 Où, grave et simple, un homme, acharné sur sa tâche,
 Engage avec nos maux un duel sans relâche,
 Et nous rend tout l’honneur perdu!⁷⁶

As is evident in Manuel’s poem, the laboratory was regarded as the seat of Pasteur’s grandeur, the locus of his discoveries as well as a place in which greatness and history were made. The laboratory was considered a modern space *par excellence*: it was filled with newly invented technologies and tools, and was understood as the breeding ground for innovations and discoveries. As a space dedicated to experimentation, teaching and intellectual pursuits, it was regarded as a site of modern progress and national pride. During a time in which the future power and success of France were being questioned, labs were seen to pump out knowledge, thus producing the necessary advances to keep France a leading nation. The importance of laboratories as centres for learning, peace and

⁷⁵ For discussions of eighteenth and nineteenth-century conventions used in painting portraits of doctors and scientists, see R. Weisberg and Jordanova (2000).

⁷⁶ *Grand Festival au profit de l’Institut Pasteur, organisé par la Conférence ‘Scientia’, Palais du Trocadéro, 11 May 1886* (Paris, 1886).

prosperity was propagated by Pasteur, who wrote in his speech for his Jubilee celebrations at the Sorbonne in 1892 that students should “live in the serene peace of laboratories and libraries.”⁷⁷

Representations of laboratories in the popular press in the late nineteenth century show that these scientific spaces were dominated by men. As is evident in multiple prints by Alexis Lemaistre published in the slightly later illustrated volume *L'institut de France et nos grands établissements scientifiques* from 1896, laboratories and classrooms dedicated to science were seen as spaces in which modern men taught, studied, and experimented. Lemaistre published four prints pertaining to Pasteur and the spaces in which he worked. The first image shows Pasteur reading alone in a laboratory filled with caged animals (Fig. 10). The dogs and rabbits depicted by Lemaistre indicate their essential role in Pasteur's discovery of a vaccine for rabies while the chicken symbolizes Pasteur's discovery of a cure of chicken cholera. As in Edelfelt's portrait, Pasteur is portrayed as a solitary figure, deep in thought. Pasteur's absorption in scientific pursuits is indicated not only by his glasses, skullcap and hand-held note but also by the enveloping laboratory, which contains the objects of his experiments.

In the second image, a young boy is in the process of being inoculated (Fig. 11). The scientists and doctors are indicated by their attire – skullcaps, needles and white lab coats. Laboratory work is given a human face as these men of science dedicate their time and effort to the curing and protection of children. Although Pasteur's laboratory was primarily represented as a space of experimentation, his laboratories were also the site of inoculation and curing. Rather than being treated in a hospital, Pasteur's patients were ‘cured’ in this modern experimental space.

In the third print, two men, shown with concentrated expressions and wearing white work aprons, extract the spinal marrow from a rabbit – a process that was used in the discovery and creation of a vaccine for rabies (Fig. 12). Although the technological and experimental progress of science is indicated by the extraction tool, a glass beaker, the laboratory itself, work aprons, and the serious faces of the two scientists, the dogs and rabbits lounging in the foreground disavow the sense that this is an accurate rendition of modern life, as animals were not permitted to run loose in the lab. Sitting comfortably on a chair and huddled around table legs, the animals appear calm and ready in the face of scientific experimentation. As the two types of animals that were simultaneously victims

⁷⁷ Louis Pasteur, *Jubilée de M. Pasteur* (Paris, 1893) as cited in Geison, p. 262.

and saviours in the discovery of a vaccine for rabies, the docile pet rabbits and dogs represented by Lemaistre construct scientific experimentation as gentle and humane. Laboratory work needed to be shown as rational and compassionate. Scientists could not appear to take too much pleasure in their work, especially in the case of Pasteur's studies, which involved experimenting on animals. The easy slippage between being presented as a scientist who used living creatures to save humanity versus one who used them to advance his own cause is evident when comparing the image of Pasteur on the cover of *Vanity Fair* in 1887 with a nineteenth-century cartoon (Fig. 13, 14). On the magazine cover Pasteur is represented as a calm and serious man. He is holding two pure white rabbits in his arms while his right hand strokes a rabbit's back. In contrast, the cartoon shows Pasteur standing on an ugly mutt, preparing to inject the dog with an oversized syringe full of the rabies virus. Here, Pasteur is portrayed as a man who gives animals rabies so that his experiments and scientific prowess can continue.

The intense and focused work of men in laboratories is further evident in Lemaistre's fourth print, "La table de microbes". In this work, men are crowded in a laboratory, looking through microscopes and examining microbe activity (Fig. 15). By being involved in an intricate and laborious task, the men's intellectual and specialized pursuits are highlighted, thus constructing the lab as an exclusive space meant only for the educated. The crowded suited bodies, bald heads and assorted facial hair depicted by Lemaistre mark the laboratory as a space of masculinity. The close connection between masculinity and specialized scientific education are further entwined in Lemaistre's print *Le cours de médecine*, where props of nineteenth-century masculinity, the top hat and walking stick, are shown on a laboratory table amongst scales, specimens under glass and other scientific paraphernalia (Fig. 16).

Gsell also represented Pasteur's laboratory as a male only space. The painting shows Pasteur with four male colleagues at work in the laboratory at the École Normale (this was the laboratory that Pasteur used until the opening of the Pasteur Institute in 1888). In Gsell's portrait, the laboratory, rather than Pasteur and the other men, becomes the subject of the painting. Books, tools, pipettes, flasks, glass jars, microscopes and other scientific objects crowd the painting's surface, pushing Pasteur and his colleagues to the periphery. Unlike an early study of the painting in which Pasteur and a younger colleague are shown having a discussion in the centre of the canvas, in the finished work, the man with whom Pasteur is speaking is practically cut out of the canvas (Fig. 17). As

exemplified by the small figure in the right background, whose profile just manages to peek out from amongst the glasses, books, wires and piping, Gsell represented man as small, insignificant and lost in the face of scientific experimentation. The lab has taken over. The tools and objects of science are scattered around his canvas, messy and unorganized. In contrast, Edelfelt presented Pasteur's same laboratory near the Rue d'Ulm as meticulously ordered: Pasteur is holding a labelled jar and four glass objects sit properly in a shallow box. Despite the different ways in which the artists depicted Pasteur's laboratory, both portraits were praised for their attention to detail.

Critics praised the realistic details of Edelfelt's painting and provided their own meticulous descriptions of the work.⁷⁸ As is evident by the ease with which critics described the portrait, contemporary viewers were familiar with Pasteur, his actions and his professional space. Alfred de Lostalot's description is typical of those provided in reviews:

La peinture de M. Edelfelt nous montre M. Pasteur absorbé dans ses recherches; la tête penchée, il consulte du regard un bocal de verre où pend un lambeau de chair sanglante: c'est la terrible moelle de lapin rabique qui, par l'effort de son génie, se convertira en baume guérisseur du plus horrible mal. Le tableau est excellent et rempli d'intérêt; la lumière joue librement sur les ustensiles du laboratoire, et cependant aucun détail ne vient distraire de la grandeur du sujet.⁷⁹

As evidenced by Lostalot's review, Edelfelt portrayed Pasteur as an intense scientist and a solitary researcher. In turn, science is represented as an introverted and purely intellectual pursuit. In the painting, light falls through the windows illuminating Pasteur's pensive face and the chemistry equipment scattered across the tabletop. The tools of science and the mind of science are presented as equally enlightened, their dominance pictorially highlighted not only by their prominent position in the composition, but also by the depiction of bright light that falls on them in comparison to the dark recesses of the painted laboratory. As Lostalot wrote, it was Pasteur's genius that transformed a rabid rabbit spine into a cure. The other 1887 Salon portraits also used representations of large windows and natural light to symbolize the intellect of the scientific professionals. In all three paintings, huge windows allow the scenes of scientific study to become illuminated. The rendering of day light lead critics to the

⁷⁸ For an interesting discussion of the role of detail in realist representations, see Naomi Schor, *Reading in Detail: Aesthetics and the Feminine* (London, 1987).

⁷⁹ Lostalot, p. 459.

conclusion that these were realist works, showing scenes of modern life without recourse to artificiality or subjective spectacularization.

Realistic representations of contemporary men living in the modern world were both popular and praised in the 1886 Salon criticism. As Ganderax wrote:

Le principal, aujourd'hui, pour la peinture de genre ou plutôt pour la peinture, c'est l'homme; j'entends l'homme contemporain, saisi dans son milieu habituel: à la campagne, à la ville ou à la maison; dans un pays quelconque, en province ou à Paris; en relation avec ses semblables et en action, ou bien isolé, au repos. Quoi d'étonnant? Vers la fin de ce siècle, où la science des religions et l'histoire des peuples ont commencé de se bien établir, ne voyons-nous pas la vogue triomphale du roman? Et de quelle sorte de roman? De celui qui se fonde sur l'observation de la réalité pour représenter à notre esprit un groupe de personnes contemporaines ou une seule. En s'adressant à nos yeux, la peinture à l'heure qu'il est, ne fait guère autre chose.⁸⁰

Ganderax's review links the representation of contemporary figures with literary realism, as every detail of contemporary man's life was to be observed, studied and, in turn, represented faithfully. Significantly, realism was regarded as the perfect style for portraiture because it was believed to best display a sitter's visual likeness. Realist paintings and novels alike were understood as focusing on the acute observation of contemporary man's interactions with the world. As evidenced by E.M. de Vogüé's 1886 article on realism in *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, contemporary artists and writers:

ont abouti à un art d'observation plus que d'imagination, qui se flatte de représenter la vie telle qu'elle est, dans son ensemble et sa complexité, avec le moindre parti-pris possible chez l'artiste. Il prend l'homme dans les conditions communes, les caractères dans le train de chaque jour, moyens et changeants. Jaloux de la rigueur des procédés scientifiques, l'écrivain se propose de nous renseigner par une analyse perpétuelle des sentiments et des actes, bien plus que de nous divertir ou de nous émouvoir par l'intrigue et le spectacle des passions.⁸¹

For Melchior, observation and perpetual analysis took precedence over imagination and spectacle. Realism, understood as a stylistic category that drew upon the rigors of the scientific method, was regarded as the best mode for representing modern life and modern men. In May 1886, *L'art moderne* also pushed this view when it republished Arthur Steven's 1868 article "De la Modernité dans l'art". In this text, Steven argued that, "Pour faire un portrait, l'artiste résume toute ce qu'il a médité dans sa vie; il met en jeu toute sa science, afin de faire vivre le modèle. Il est mal à l'aise pour inventer et pour

⁸⁰ Louis Ganderax, "Causerie sur Le Salon", *La République Française*, 10 June, 1886, n.p.

⁸¹ Eugène-Melchior de Vogüé, "De la Littérature Réalistes – A propos du roman russe", *Revue des Deux Mondes*, May-June 1886, p. 289.

tricher.”⁸² For Steven, portraiture was based on knowledge (*‘science’*), not imagination or deception.

Yet the critical success of a portrait was not guaranteed by the representation of all information, but was rather secured by the artist’s careful choice of specific details.

As argued by Lafenestre:

Les portraitistes ne pouvaient rester insensibles à ce grand mouvement de retour vers une observation plus attentive des détails réels...C’est une tendance déjà très répandue de placer, autant que possible, les personnes vivantes dans leur milieu habituel au lieu d’isoler leur visage ou leur personne sur un fond neutre ou indifférent....Autant il peut être utile d’expliquer une physionomie par l’accompagnement choisi de quelques accessoires révélant ses habitudes intellectuelles ou physiques, autant il pourrait être inconvenant de noyer cette physionomie sous l’amas de détails exacts, mais parfaitement insignifiants [sic]. La naturalisme, tel que peuvent le pratiquer les portraitistes comme tous les autres peintres, n’est point du tout l’acception en bloc de tous les détails qu’offre pêle-mêle la nature, mais seulement le choix intelligent, parmi les détails, de ceux qui peuvent communiquer plus de clarté, plus d’éclat, plus de force, plus de charme au sujet traité.⁸³

As is evident in this review, the production of modern portraiture did not depend on painting every detail that one actually saw, but rather in creating a scene that could best be read as a real representation of the person portrayed.⁸⁴ This review also shows how some critics believed objectivity and subjectivity were both required in the production of realistic portraits. Constructing a realist portrait entailed a process of inclusion and exclusion, as only those elements of the real world that contributed favourably to the identity of the sitter and the artist were included in the final product. Lafenestre criticized Edelfelt’s realism for going too far:

Rien de plus naturel, rien de plus vivant; c’est exact, c’est amusant, mais, en vérité, le mobilier parle aussi haut que la figure, la physionomie du penseur s’efface au milieu des verreries qui scintillent, et, malgré l’intérêt de curiosité que la postérité attachera certainement au reportage minutieux et ingénieux du peintre suédois, ce n’est pas à lui qu’elle demandera l’image définitive de M. Pasteur.⁸⁵

⁸² Arthur Stevens, “De la modernité dans l’art”, *L’art moderne*, 10 May 1886.

⁸³ Lafenestre (1886), p. 597.

⁸⁴ Like realism, the term naturalism has been defined in many ways. Although the two terms are often regarded as different in current art historical and literary debates - naturalism is often associated with detailed representations and the rejection of the idealization of experience whereas realism is defined as the rejection of the beautiful in favour of unidealized representations of contemporary life - the ease with which many nineteenth-century Salon critics used them interchangeably implies that they were both ascribed to formal strategies that produced images that were believed to represent visible reality accurately and objectively. The definition of *‘naturalisme’* in Larousse, *Grand dictionnaire universelle du XIXe siècle* further substantiates this point as it is defined as *“réalisme”*. Larousse, *Grand dictionnaire universelle du XIXe siècle*, (Paris, 1867), p. 859.

⁸⁵ Lafenestre (1886), p. 597.

For Lafenestre, it was Bonnat's work that could provide the quintessential image of Pasteur because the painting's details did not overpower the sitter's individuality and identity.

The ambiguous space of Bonnat's background contrasts with the depth and detail created by the laboratory scenes painted by Edelfelt and Gsell. Gone are the books, glass jars and scientific tools that crowd the table-tops in the other paintings. The laboratory itself has disappeared. In contrast to Edelfelt and Gsell's portraits, Bonnat's work is relatively devoid of narrative setting, as Pasteur and his grand-daughter are shown against a dark backdrop. The details of their bodies contrast with the murky background of black, grey and reddish-brown paint. Yet the background painted by Bonnat is not monotonous or even-toned. Rather, light and colour play across the painted surface, creating a sense of depth in which the sitters stand. Bonnat did not usually depict his sitters surrounded by objects. As Alisa Luxenberg explains in her focused study on Bonnat, he rarely portrayed his sitters' homes or professions, and never painted their possessions or furniture. Despite the omission of objects from modern life, Bonnat's portraits were nevertheless understood as modern because his figures' gestures and postures were believed to reveal their individual modern character.⁸⁶ Bonnat believed it was difficult to create a portrait that provided both a realistic representation of a sitter's body and an accurate sense of personality. Bonnat turned to the scientific method in order to discuss the difficulties of painting portraits. He wrote that:

Une oeuvre d'art et une théorie fondée sur des recherches expérimentales ont ceci de commun qu'elles nous proposent l'une et l'autre comme un arrangement conclu entre l'intelligence et la nature après d'âpres combats... Une manière d'armistice difficile à faire accepter par le jugement du public, surtout quand l'artiste s'attaque au mystères de la nature humaine dans le but de restituer en même temps que la ressemblance physique d'un individu, ce qu'il y a en lui de moins inconstant et de plus invisible.⁸⁷

Bonnat believed that the ability to realistically represent invisible character and physical likeness was paramount for a successful portrait. Although one reviewer criticized Bonnat, asking him to change the dull background, others believed this 'empty' backdrop highlighted the realistic rendering of Pasteur and thus better displayed his actual being.⁸⁸

⁸⁶ Alisa Luxenberg, "Léon Bonnat (1833-1922)", PhD dissertation, New York University, 1990, pp. 138-139.

⁸⁷ As cited in Vincent Ducourau, "Introduction", *Léon Bonnat* (Bayonne, 1998), np.

⁸⁸ The critic of *L'Art Moderne* wrote that, "Si M. Bonnat modifiait sa couleur sèche, noire, immuablement figée dans la sauce dont il transmet orgueilleusement la recette aux marmitons qui s'efforcent d'atteindre au

Lafenestre preferred Bonnat's stark portrait to Edelfelt's laboratory scene:

Le savant est isolé, bien isolé, pour qu'on le voie mieux, comme une statue sur son piédestal. Son visage, dont la clarté, au-dessus des vêtements [sic] noirs, saisit seule le regard, s'enlève, avec une précision énergique, comme une médaille rudiment frappée, sur le fond indifférent, avec une force d'expression intellectuelle d'autant plus entière que rien alentour ne peut l'atténuer... Il est permis de croire que, chaque fois qu'il s'agira d'un visage où l'intelligence surtout doit parler, il sera convenable d'user de discrétion et de ne pas étouffer cette parole de l'âme sous le bruissement confus du murmure des choses.⁸⁹

For this reviewer, the stark simplicity of Bonnat's background and the lifelike depiction of Pasteur's face were the best way to display the chemist's intellect and inner being. Unlike Edelfelt's painting, in which Pasteur's mental aptitude is symbolized by books, glass tubes and a laboratory setting, it was the lack of detailed objects that made some critics see Bonnat's painting as a more accurate depiction. The simplicity of form and the focus on the individual led Lafenestre to draw a connection between Bonnat's portraits and public sculptures and medals. Bonnat's portrait of Pasteur, like the sculptures of prominent Frenchmen exhibited in the public spaces of Paris, displayed the new-found status of science through monumental portrayals of modern masculinities and male bodies. Propped up on pedestals, these isolated bodies became indicators of status, identity and professional gain. Representations of scientific professionals began to occupy the spaces and authority previously held by politicians, religious leaders and royalty as the late nineteenth century saw the erection of many large-scale sculptures of prominent doctors and scientists in front of Parisian hospitals and teaching centres. Although the majority of these sculptures were built during the second half of the nineteenth century, the men portrayed came from many historical periods, from Hippocrates to contemporary men. As is evident by the multiple marble and plaster busts of medical men and scientists that were scattered in and around the buildings of the École de Médecine during the 1870s and 1880s, medical institutions used portraiture to create a seemingly consistent and unified history of medicine and the medical profession (Fig. 18). The connection drawn between Bonnat's representation of Pasteur and these public sculptures imbued Pasteur with the characteristics traditionally ascribed to sculptural portraits of 'great men': stability, grandeur and authority. The Salon, like public squares

genie du cuisinier chef, il y aurait sans doute des mumures." "Le Salon de 1886", *L'Art Moderne*, 23 May 1886, p. 163.

⁸⁹ Lafenestre (1886), p. 598.

and academic courtyards, became a venue for the exhibitions of professional portraits, displaying prominent male bodies for public delectation.

Head Shots: Photographic Portraits of Pasteur and other Scientists

Although many critics praised Bonnat's portrait of Pasteur for its realistic representation of the scientist, the artist's lifelike depictions and solid backgrounds were also a source of criticism. Bonnat's compositional focus on his sitters and relatively blank backgrounds lead many critics to describe Bonnat's portraits as dull and photographic.⁹⁰ J. Meriem wrote in 1882 that Bonnat's work had "une précision froide et photographique."⁹¹ The dullness of Bonnat's portrait of Pasteur was also noted in the 1886 Salon criticism. C. de Beaulieu wrote that "on ne peut que se répéter en admirant la peinture du maître et en le priant d'en changer les fonds,"⁹² and Henry Fèvre wrote in his review of Bonnat's 1886 portraits that, "Comme portraitiste, M. Bonnat ne fait l'effet que d'un passable coloriste de fallacieuses photographies."⁹³ Charles Ponsonailhe criticized the work for its similarities to photographic portraiture in his review in *L'Artiste*, writing that, "The illustrious scientist is standing in that stiff pose of a photographer's victim, with one of those copper apparatuses called 'a sustainer' that one finds in the photographer's studio stuck down his back."⁹⁴ The conventions of painted portraiture merged and converged with those of photographic portraiture. Bonnat's painting, with its solid background and highlighted figure, is similar to many photographic portraits, such as those that Nadar took of professional men like Jules Michelet, in which a male figure is photographed against a plain backdrop and lit by focused light (Fig. 19). Bonnat's portrait of Pasteur also goes against the more populist conventions of photographic portraiture during the 1880s as Pasteur is represented simply in a non-specific space with his granddaughter as his only 'prop'.

By the late nineteenth century, most photographic portraits had appropriated many of the conventions of painted portraiture, particularly the practice of surrounding

⁹⁰ Luxenberg points out that Bonnat, like other nineteenth-century artists, was familiar with and surrounded by photographs. Although there is no documentary evidence to explain his use of photography, or that his use was very different from other artists, it is most likely that he used them in order to create physical likeness. Interestingly, Luxenberg notes that Bonnat's artistic development ran counter to photography's. Luxenberg, p. 159.

⁹¹ J. Meriem, "Tableaux et Statues (Salon de 1882)" as cited in Olivier Lépine, *Équivoques: Peintures françaises du XIXe siècle*, ex.cat. Musée des Arts Décoratifs, 9 March–14 May 1973, p. 31.

⁹² C. de Beaulieu *Le Salon de 1886*, supplement to *La Gazette du Dimanche*, Paris, 1886, pp. 24-25.

⁹³ Henry Fèvre, *Études sur le salon de 1886 et sur l'exposition des impressionists* (Paris, 1886), p. 33.

⁹⁴ Charles Ponsonailhe, "Salon de 1886", *L'Artiste*, June 1886, p. 440-441 as translated in Weisberg, p. 605.

sitters with objects: ornate materials, classical pilars and well-stocked bookshelves were all used as a means to construct and display social status. As more photographic studios opened in Paris and as the cost of having portraits taken decreased, the public were able to be photographed dressed in the fancy costumes and standing in the elaborate scenes provided by the studios. The ease and accessibility of being portrayed above one's station not only contributed to the general belief that portraiture had become the bourgeois genre *par excellence*, but it also decreased the social value of such portraiture, as the objects traditionally associated with royal and aristocratic status became deprived of this value through mass use. Photographic portraiture allowed for the staging of identity and status – it was a type of performance involving costumes, props and backdrops. The identity displayed was the product of the photograph and not anterior to it.

Although Bonnat's portrait's similarity to photography had negative connotations because the painting was seen as dull, bourgeois and commercial, the portrait's resemblance to photographic portraiture also imbued it with photography's understood objectivity and claim to truth. Cameras were considered mechanism of truth: technical and detached from subjectivity. Luxenberg has suggested that Bonnat's identity as a keen scientific observer led critics to use photography – understood as realistic and scientific – to described Bonnat's paintings and style. Bonnat was known for having measured his sitter's faces before painting them. Such an act aligned the painter with scientific professionals, as phrenologists performed similar tasks on human bodies. This type of measurement was considered more scientific than artistic as conventional artistic training promoted the depiction of human proportions based on idealization rather than individual measurement.⁹⁵ Bonnat's link to scientific study was further enhanced by some of his most well-known paintings, particularly his state commissioned copy of Rembrandt's *Anatomy Lesson of Doctor Tulp* of 1871-72, which was familiar to artists because of its display at the Musée des Copies, and his portrayal of Christ in his controversial work *Christ en croix* of 1874, which was made for the Palais de Justice (Fig. 20). Some critics wrote that Bonnat's Christ was too real, claiming that Bonnat used a cadaver as a model. Roger Ballu wrote that, "En vérité, il faut avoir touché au scalpel pour être aussi exacte avec le pinceau", the writer for *L'illustration* claimed that it was "desinée avec une précision tout anatomique", and Louis Gonse claimed that the smell of an amphitheatre

⁹⁵ Luxenberg, p. 158.

lingered near this work.⁹⁶ Bonnat's association with scientific themes was further enhanced by his students, such as Thomas Eakins, who also painted medical themes.

Bonnat's picture's resemblance to a photographic portrait also connected it to the many professional photographic portraits made of men of science. These portraits were both products and producers of the rise in the professionalization of science: they were used to illustrate newspaper articles and the numerous biographies of French scientific heroes, were distributed to friends and family, particularly after death, and were also used as visiting cards. Pasteur had many photographic portraits taken over the course of his professional career, most of which were head and shoulder shots, showing him formally dressed in a black suit, a red pin of the *légion d'honneur* on his lapel, and his face looking out at the viewer with a serious expression. In the majority of images, Pasteur is shown seated against a plain backdrop. One of the earliest photographic portraits of Pasteur was taken by Pierre Petit, a photographer who Pasteur used throughout his life for both personal and scientific work. In this photograph, Pasteur is represented wearing glasses, the chain of his pocket watch coming out from underneath his jacket (Fig. 21). Sitting back in a chair, the young Pasteur exudes confidence and seriousness. This portrait contrasts with those taken during the height of Pasteur's scientific reign during the 1880s. In these portraits, particularly those by Nadar from 1878, Pasteur has aged, his dark hair has whitened, heavy bags have formed under his eyes and deep wrinkles have punctured his skin (Fig. 22).

The most widely distributed photographs of Pasteur at this time were those by Nadar. A well-known portraitist during the nineteenth century, Nadar had been photographing the prominent men of France since the mid-century. Nadar also had a personal connection to Pasteur because Nadar was the neighbour of Doctor Grancher. Grancher was a personal and professional acquaintance of Pasteur; Pasteur had asked Grancher to perform the first rabies inoculation on a human patient because Pasteur, a chemist, was not legally qualified. In Nadar's portrait of Pasteur, a grey-haired and bearded Pasteur stares out at the viewer. Shown against a plain backdrop and from the mid-chest up, Pasteur is dressed in a suit, his *légion d'honneur* pin is aligned with the buttons on his jacket, and a thin chain is strung around his neck and down his front, leading to the eye-glasses that are cut from the image. This portrait was reproduced in

⁹⁶ As cited in Luxenberg's discussion of the painting's display, pp. 195-199: Roger Ballu "Les Peintures de M. Bonnat au Palais du Justice", *L'Art*, VI, 1886, p. 123-124, Anonymous, "Salon de 1874", I, *L'illustration*, 32, XIII, and Louis Gonse, "Salon de 1874", *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 15 June 1874, p. 511.

multiple sizes and used for different purposes. Copies that exist today show that it was used as Pasteur's *carte du cabinet* and was also reproduced as a large scale photograph, as is evident by the copy given by Nadar to Doctor Émile Roux, Pasteur's main laboratory assistant (Fig. 23, 24).⁹⁷ Roux was integral to the discovery of the rabies vaccine as he worked both alongside Pasteur and on his own. It has even been suggested by current historians of science, such as Gerald Geison and Bruno Latour, that Pasteur's final rabies vaccine was based on Roux's experiments rather than his own. In the large copy given to Roux, now on display at the Pasteur Institute, Nadar signed the bottom and dedicated the picture to Roux:

A Monsieur le Docteur Roux,
Très respectueux et admiratif hommage,
Nadar
Portrait exécuté en 1886

By adding the date and dedication, Nadar displayed his connection with Pasteur and Roux during the exact time of the discovery of a vaccine for rabies. This inscription not only emphasized Nadar's personal connection to Pasteur and Roux, but highlighted his status as a witness and participant in historical events.

Rosalind Krauss claims in her examination of Nadar's memoir, *Quand j'étais photographe*, that Nadar was more interested in exhibiting his status as witness to historical events than in displaying his personal successes as a photographer.⁹⁸ She argues that Nadar's text is primarily concerned with providing readers with psychological, emotional and physical accounts of history.⁹⁹ Krauss creates flexible positions for Nadar, allowing him to move from photographer to historian, or rather, allowing him to merge the two positions into one. Yet it is not only Nadar's position as witness that is evident in his signed portrait of Pasteur: his role as scientist is also present. Nadar's signature and dedication on the portrait construct the photographer as a participant in the discourse of scientific progress as he linked his name and product (photography) with the prominent scientific figures, Pasteur and Roux. The respectful and admirable homage is paid to Roux by Nadar not only through the representation of Pasteur, but also through the photograph itself. In Nadar's discussion of the great innovations of the nineteenth century in *Quand j'étais photographe*, he put photography

⁹⁷ For examinations of how photographic portraits were used for personal and professional propaganda, see Donald E. English, *Political Uses of Photography in the Third French Republic* (Ann Arbor, 1984).

⁹⁸ Rosalind Krauss, "Tracing Nadar", *October*, 5, summer 1978, pp. 29-47.

⁹⁹ Krauss, p. 29.

in competition with other scientific discoveries, such as bacteriology, anaesthesiology, steam engines and the electric light. Despite acknowledging the import of such discoveries, Nadar nonetheless wrote:

But do not all these miracles pale when compared to the most astonishing and disturbing one of all, that one which seems finally to endow man himself with the divine power of creation: the power to give physical form to the unsubstantial image that vanishes as soon as it is perceived, leaving no shadow in the mirror, no ripple on the surface of the water?¹⁰⁰

For Nadar, photography was arguably the greatest scientific discovery of the nineteenth century. Nadar linked the progress of science with the divinity of creation, thus merging the two forces into the figure of the photographer.¹⁰¹ Nadar, as a photographer, was empowered with the ability to fix bodies and events into print. He was, therefore, a witness to and a recorder of history and people. As a portraitist, he provided representations of bodies that could be documented and studied. He had the power to replace the real with like-life images.

Although Nadar's photographs reveal a reliance on the conventions of painted portraiture – his sitter's position in half, three quarter or full scale portraits, the arrangement of light and the figure's pose – they are also similar to the photographs of patients and criminals that emerged from nineteenth-century hospitals and police stations (Fig. 25, 26). These visual similarities show the unstable and shifting link between photographic portraiture and science, and that between portraiture and art. Alan Sekula has argued that photographic portraiture was a double system of representation that functioned both “honorifically” and “repressively”: it extended and popularized the traditional function of portraiture while the medium of photography simultaneously undermined the status inherent to the genre.¹⁰² Sekula claims that the joining of photography with the study of phrenology in 1846 created an archive in which the criminal body was produced in its opposing relationship to the law-abiding bourgeois body. With the emergence of the mug shot and the creation and collection of photographs of criminals by the police in Paris during the 1880s, exemplified by the work of the Paris police official Alphonse Bertillon, photographic portraiture became associated with social deviance, crime and illness as much as with heroic healthy

¹⁰⁰ As cited in Krauss, p. 30.

¹⁰¹ Krauss sees the notion of the trace in photography standing between science and spiritualism, p. 35.

¹⁰² Alan Sekula, “The Body and the Archive”, *October*, 39, winter 1986, p. 7.

bodies.¹⁰³ Sekula points out how the bodies of criminals, like the bodies of famous men, were read as texts because it was believed that their physiognomies showed proof of deviance or moral superiority.

Nadar took two photographs of Pasteur: one a profile shot and the other head-on (Fig. 27). These two photographs, particularly when examined together, look like the mug shots that were being produced in Parisian prisons and hospitals during the nineteenth century. Like the institutionally produced photographs of criminals, the profile of Pasteur demands a physiognomic reading as it provides an up-close and detailed picture of Pasteur's face. The profile shot does not allow Pasteur to look out at the viewer and therefore makes him the object of the viewer's gaze. Everything is visible: the individual white strands that pepper Pasteur's hair, the crooked fold of his ear and its fleshy lobe, the pattern of wrinkles surrounding his eyes, and the deep line that runs from his nostril, across his cheek only to be lost in his prickly beard. Although Nadar's profile of Pasteur fits within medical and criminal iconography, there is no doubt that this is a portrait rather than a mug shot because Pasteur's *légion d'honneur* pin, despite being out of focus, is nonetheless present, indicating his standing as an honourable French citizen. Furthermore, the photograph was taken by Nadar, who was as much a celebrity as those he captured. Nadar's signature on the photograph indicates that it was to be understood as a portrait rather than a specimen.

Pasteur, like many other men of science, was interested in the technological advances and scientific uses of photography. Photography was celebrated as both a product and producer of scientific advances. Pasteur began publishing and using photomicrographies in the 1870s. Photography, like the microscope, was a tool used in scientific pursuits because it could perform feats that were incapable for the human eye. Photography appeared to fix the world into static images while microscopes made the invisible visible: they were both modern scientific apparatuses of sight. In his thesis, "Applications de la photographie à la médecine" from 1896, A Burais dedicated a few pages to Pasteur's use of photography. He wrote that:

Dès l'origine de la Photographie, on a compris les services que cette nouvelle conquête scientifique pourrait rendre aux savants utilisant le microscope. Non seulement elle fixe d'une façon durable l'image d'une préparation qui peut être

¹⁰³ For an informative discussion of how photography functioned as a tool of social discipline, see John Tagg, "Power and photography: part one, a means of surveillance: the photograph as evidence in law", *Screen Education*, 36, winter 1980, pp 17-55 and *The Burden of Representation: Essays on Photographies and Histories* (Minesota, 1993).

modifiée au bout de peu de temps, mais encore, par son caractère d'indiscutable authenticité, elle permet de mieux faire comprendre les descriptions et parfois montre des particularités ou des détails qui, au microscope, peuvent échapper à l'oeil le plus exercé.

Comme le disait, en 1887, M. le Dr Roux, chef du service de Microbiologie technique à l'Institut Pasteur: 'En Microbiologie, la meilleur manière d'écrire est de mettre un texte court à côté d'un grand nombre de planches bien faites.'¹⁰⁴

As is evident from Burais' text, photography was considered a scientific rather than artistic invention. This connection to science was believed to provide photography with a guarantee of veracity. Burais argued that photography could improve knowledge because it could provide details that went unnoticed not only by the untrained eye but by the microscope, another technology of vision that improved upon human eyesight.¹⁰⁵ Roux's statement also emphasizes the importance of the visual in scientific study by claiming that photographic images were superior to textual descriptions. Text was time consuming to create, to read and to absorb. Unlike photography, which was believed to be devoid of human involvement and indiscriminate in its recording, texts were understood as subjective records of the writer's experience.

Pasteur's use of photography served multiple purposes. It helped advance his own studies as photography provided static microscopic images of otherwise invisible organisms that could be referred to at will. It also popularized and helped spread Pasteur's discoveries internationally as his photographs of germs and diseases were published in scientific journals, including those which came out of the Pasteur Institute. These photographs were presented by Pasteur as visible proof and evidence of his scientific theories. Photomicrography exhibited Pasteur's connection to the latest technological advances, thus constructing him as a scientific forerunner. The building of a photographic studio at the Pasteur Institute further contributed to the construction of the modernity of science, Pasteur and his institute. It also located the production and advancements of photography in the scientific realm, as photographic studios were being built in the most prominent scientific centres in Paris: Charcot opened one at the Salpêtrière in 1878, and Hôpital Saint-Louis, where Péan worked, also produced photographs.

¹⁰⁴ A. Burais, "Applications de la photographie à la médecine", thesis for a doctorate in medicine, Paris, 22 July 1896, pp. 27-28.

¹⁰⁵ For an analysis of how conceptions of sight changed with the emergence of new technologies of vision, see Crary, (1990).

Yet Pasteur had a personal interest in photography that went beyond the representation of microbes. As is evident in a letter he wrote in October 1881 to thank Mme Saint-Claire Deville for sending him a photograph of her deceased husband, Pasteur had specific views on photographic portraiture (Fig. 28). In particular, he had set ideas on how men of science should be represented:

Chère Madame,

J'ai été bien heureux de recevoir le portrait de mon cher ami. Mon Dieu! Qu'il est ressemblant! Que vous devez être heureuse de le regarder et de lire dans son âme en le voyant! Je connais trois photographies admirables, celle de M.V. Regnault, celle de M. Brongniart et celle-ci. Mais celle-ci est plus belle et plus vraie encore que les deux autres. Vous me feriez le plus grand plaisir, chère Madame, de me donner le nom du photographe. Est-il toujours aussi bien inspiré? J'aimerais laisser à ma famille quelque chose d'approchant, le jour où il faudra lui dire le dernier adieu.

Merci donc, et mille fois, chère Madame, de votre gracieux souvenir.

L. Pasteur¹⁰⁶

Pasteur praised the portrait for its realistic depiction of Monsieur Deville, pointing out that the photograph provided such a life-like resemblance that it allowed the viewer to see the man's soul. The photograph appeared to replace the deceased body, allowing the surviving friends and family constant access to the dead through photographic representation. Photography was often associated with death during the nineteenth century: Balzac's belief that he lost a layer of himself when photographed and the use of photography in mortuary portraiture are evidence of the nineteenth-century association of the medium with death.¹⁰⁷ More recently, Roland Barthes conceptualized photography as a medium of death, seeing death in every photograph as a statement of "that-has-been."¹⁰⁸ Pasteur compared the photograph of Deville with those he had of other men of science, Henri-Victor Regnault and Adolphe-Théodore Brongniart (Fig. 29).¹⁰⁹ Regnault was a physician and chemist who was a professor at the Collège de France as well as a member of the Académie de Science. He was also actively involved in new photographic developments.¹¹⁰ Brongniart was a professor of botany and physiology, and president of the Académie de Science in 1847. Like Regnault and Brongniart, Deville was a scientist,

¹⁰⁶ Letter from Pasteur to Madame Sainte-Claire Deville, 5 October 1881, as printed in *Correspondance de Pasteur*, 1877-1884, (Paris, 1951), p. 259.

¹⁰⁷ For various essays about the relationship between death and photography in France during the nineteenth century, see *Le Dernier Portrait*, ex.cat, Musée d'Orsay, Paris, 5 March-16 May, 2002.

¹⁰⁸ Roland Barthes, *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography* (London, 1981).

¹⁰⁹ The whereabouts of the photograph of Brongniart is unknown.

¹¹⁰ For an informative account of Regnault's role in photography, see Laurie Dahlberg *Victor Regnault and the advance of photography* (Princeton, 2005).

having earned degrees in both science and medicine. The portraits of Regnault and Deville are very similar to one another. In both photographs, the men are shown dressed in suits and bow ties, sitting on chairs near desks covered with papers, their jackets are unbuttoned and their legs are loosely crossed at the ankle. Both men are depicted with one elbow propped up on a table, allowing their heads to rest on closed fists. In her discussion of the pictorial conventions used in portraits of scientists, Jordanova points out how the 'head-on-hand' pose was commonly used in representations of learned men. By drawing on portraits from various historical periods, such as Robert Walker's portrait of John Evelyn from 1648, Mary and Thomas Black's *Messenger Monsey* of 1764 and Albrecht Dürer's *Melancholia*, Jordanova claims that this pose, along with the representation of study-like spaces, books and the figure in isolation, were popular tropes used to construct men of science as pensive and highly educated (Fig.30, 31,32).¹¹¹ As is evident in the letter to Madame Deville, Pasteur wished to be photographed in the same way as Monsieur Deville: in isolation, head propped on hand, and in his work space. Although it is unknown whether or not Pasteur was given the name of Deville's photographer, it is evident that Pasteur had himself photographed in a similar way by the photographic studio Dornac et Cie (Fig. 33). Although this portrait of Pasteur was taken in his personal office, he is nonetheless represented in a similar fashion. Staring out at the viewer and seated near a desk with his head resting in his hand, Pasteur, like Regnault and Deville, is represented as a solitary and serious man, deep in thought. For Pasteur, the photographs of his friends served as personal mementos despite the pictorial conventions that also constructed them as professional portraits. Pasteur's desire to be photographed in the same way for his family reveals the ways in which portraiture, as a genre, fluctuated between fulfilling personal and professional aims and desires. It also shows how professional identities were closely bound to familiar relationships. Portraits straddled the public and private divide as they simultaneously staged professional affiliations and served as personal keepsakes.

The multiple functions of photographic portraiture are exemplified in a photographic portrait owned by Pasteur and exhibited in his home. The photograph, shot in 1847, is a portrait of Pasteur's old teacher, the scientist J.-B Biot (Fig. 34). The portrait was taken by Louis-Désiré Blanquart-Evrard, a chemist and photographer, in Regnault's laboratory at the Collège de France. Blanquart-Evrard worked on

¹¹¹ Jordanova (2000), pp. 41-43.

photographic developments with Regnault. Both men helped found the Société Héliographique in 1851 and the Société Française de Photographie in 1851, with Regnault serving as president of the SFP from 1855 until 1868. Blanquart-Evrard's photograph of Biot was scientifically significant because it was the first photograph in France to be instantly reproduced on paper. He claimed to have improved upon William Henry Fox Talbot's paper negative (collotypes) process and therefore propagated his procedure as a new invention.¹¹² Most early photographers had a link to science because advancements in photographic technology were dependent upon knowledge of chemistry.¹¹³ The rise of photographic studios in medical and scientific institutions, as well as the use of photography in scientific pursuits, made photography both a pastime and focus of many scientists. Regnault took many photographs, including numerous portraits of his colleagues. Laurie Dahlberg suggests in her study of Regnault's relationship with photography that the scientist's portraits form, most likely, the largest collection of non-commercial portrait photography taken by one person during the nineteenth century.¹¹⁴ Over 150 of his portraits survive and it is known that he took more than fifty portraits of his scientific colleagues. As is evident in the portrait of the chemist Thomas Graham from around 1851, Regnault's portraits adhere to artistic conventions of portraying professional men, as is shown by the man's seated pose and the scientific accoutrement at his side (Fig. 35). Although Regnault depicted men in their workspaces at the Collège de France, surrounded by the tools of science, the same props and rooms were used in many portraits. This suggests that although the site of taking the portraits was an actual scientific place, the scene of the portraits was nonetheless set up. Like a photographic studio, Regnault's scientific backdrop was created by carefully placed chairs, books and scientific equipment.

Blanquart-Evrard's portrait of Biot was understood as a product of the intersection between art and science as is evidenced by the writing on the bottom left of the image:

Ce dessin offre un double intérêt. Non seulement il est le portrait de l'une des grandes gloires scientifique de la France: il est en outre la première épreuve photographique réussie d'après nature. Exécuté dans le cabinet de physique du Collège de France par Blanquart-Evrard, en présence d'une commission de membres de l'Académie des Sciences et de l'Académie des beaux-arts.

¹¹² For the discovery of this invention and its controversy, see Dahlberg, pp. 10, 17, 26-28.

¹¹³ Between 1839 and 1850, the Académie de Sciences heard over 230 reports on photography. Dahlberg, p. 24.

¹¹⁴ Dahlberg, p. 79.

As attested by the text accompanying the image, the multiple witnesses to this photographic experimentation came from the worlds of both art and science. The merging of art and science is not only represented by this text but is also reinforced by the genre of portraiture and the medium of photography. Portraiture served as a bonding agent, linking art and science as the historical status of an artistic genre and the modernity of a scientific process merged. Although Blanquart-Evrard located the technological progress of photography in the laboratory by showing Biot in a known and specific scientific space, he nonetheless adhered to the artistic conventions of painted portraiture, as Biot is represented seated, staring out at the viewer, surrounded by the accessories of his profession. Blanquart-Evrard must have made the decision that his photographic experiment was going to be a portrait, rather than a still life or landscape. The genre of portraiture allowed him to display the prominent status of a well-known scientist as well as exhibit his own close connection and involvement in scientific experiments. The portrait is simultaneously the product of a scientific experiment, a record of the experiment, and a portrait of a scientist in his laboratory. Like Nadar, Blanquart-Evrard was simultaneously constructed as scientist, witness and artist through photographic portraiture.

Pasteur acquired the photograph by Blanquart-Evrard from Biot. As recorded by Vallery-Radot in *La vie de Pasteur*, Biot gave the portrait to Pasteur, saying, “Si vous placez cette épreuve à côté du portrait de votre père, vous pourrez voir réunies les images de deux personnes qui vous ont aimé à peu près d’une même façon.”¹¹⁵ Biot’s statement reveals the ways in which portraiture served both professional and familiar bonds. By having his portrait exhibited alongside that of Pasteur’s father, Biot could construct himself as Pasteur’s professional patriarch. Portraiture gave science a visible professional lineage because it displayed an individual’s personal and professional status, affiliations and import. Whether exhibited in private or public, in paint or in print, the authority, legitimacy and modernity of science was articulated through realistic representations of professional male bodies.

Pasteur’s Body: Aging, Illness and Vision

The representation of celebrities in the public press and at the Salon encouraged the public’s desire to see and examine famous bodies. Both Edelfelt and Bonnat’s

¹¹⁵ Vallery-Radot, (1900), p. 95.

portraits of Pasteur provided Salon viewers with lifelike images of the scientist that could be studied and scrutinized. As was so often expressed in both medical and popular texts during the nineteenth century, the study of the body's exterior was essential to the understanding of its interior. The nineteenth-century French fascination with the classification of bodies based on visual observation evolved from Johan Caspar Lavater's publications on physiognomies from the late eighteenth century and from the French translation of Franz Joseph Gall in 1810 and 1819.¹¹⁶ The publication of Cesare Lombroso Ferrero's *L'uomo delinquente* in 1876 confirmed the nineteenth-century belief that intellectual and moral inferiority and superiority could be anatomically explained and justified: exterior physical characteristics were understood to symbolize interior states. As exemplified in Julien Leclercq's book *La Physionomie, visages et caractères* from 1896:

C'est la science qui a pour but la connaissance de la nature intérieure de l'homme par sa nature extérieure...Personne ne 'masque', personne ne peut s'arroger des facultés qu'il ne possède pas...la physionomie de l'homme ne ment pas.¹¹⁷

The visible accuracy believed to be provided by photography and realistic portraits armed the public with the ability to inspect every inch of the body portrayed. The pleasure taken in pseudo-scientific approaches to examining bodies is further evident in Leclercq's book as it provides physiognomic readings of French celebrities. Mixing astrology with physiognomy, the author claimed that Pasteur was a good father, a gentle husband and a focused learner. The 1886 Salon criticism also concentrated on the representation of Pasteur's body, as critics read the painterly depiction of his bodily exterior as standing in for his inner character.

Salon reviews reveal the ways in which critics had difficulty coming to terms with how Pasteur should be portrayed. As is evident in the comparisons made between Edelfelt and Bonnat's work, critics took distinct positions on the two portraits because they did not see how Pasteur could be justly represented as both a heroic scientist in his laboratory and as an adoring and aging family man. Although some critics condemned Edelfelt's painting for its excessive realism, no reviewer criticized the representation of

¹¹⁶ The literature on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century physiognomy and phrenology is extensive. For discussions related to art and medicine, see Martin Kemp and Marina Wallace, *Spectacular Bodies: The Art and Science of the Human Body from Leonardo to Now*, (London, 2000), pp. 95-146; Jean Clair (ed), *L'âme au corps: arts et sciences 1793-1993*, ex.cat. Galeries nationales du Grand Palais (Paris, 1994), particularly the essays in the section "Le temps de la phrénologie", pp. 196-299; Barbara Maria Stafford, *Body Criticism: Imagining the Unseen in Enlightenment Art and Medicine* (Cambridge, Mass, 1991), pp. 84-129.

¹¹⁷ Julien Leclercq, *La Physionomie, visages et caractères* (Paris, 1896), pp. 5-6.

Pasteur in a laboratory. In contrast, some critics had a problem with Bonnat's painting because Pasteur was shown as a grandfather rather than scientist. By showing the private face of Pasteur in public, Bonnat's painting did not sit comfortably in the heroic Republican iconography of the early Third Republic. Perhaps the representation of Pasteur's aging body appeared to contradict Bonnat's realist style that was described by many critics as strong, healthy, masculine and direct - all characteristics the Republic deemed valuable.¹¹⁸ Although Bonnat's Pasteur is portrayed with all the accoutrements of modern male respectability - a buttoned black jacket over black trousers, the red pin of the *légion d'honneur*, eyeglasses, a bow tie, sombre expression and well-trimmed hair and beard - the inclusion of his granddaughter appeared to threaten his masculine virility.

This inclusion also altered the traditional single portrait into a painting that displayed a familiar bond. William Walton discussed the possible reasons for Bonnat's inclusion of the grand daughter and exclusion of a laboratory when he wrote:

The Finnish artist had taken the trouble to paint his sitter in his laboratory, surrounded by the instruments of his researches, 'in his habit as he lived,' and had thereby secured what might be considered a more intimate rendering of the subject. M. Bonnat - possibly scorning such aids - had chosen to represent the domestic side of the man of science and introduced the little grand-daughter to touch our affections.¹¹⁹

Although it is likely that Bonnat had seen Edelfelt's painting before he began his own, it seems unreasonable to suggest that Bonnat would have painted Pasteur in his laboratory, as it was not Bonnat's practice to paint his sitters in elaborate work settings. The decision to include the granddaughter was made by J.C. Jacobsen, who commissioned Pasteur's portrait. It is likely that he was following the wishes of Madame Pasteur. Madame Pasteur's involvement in the painting's production was not noted by critics, and therefore the attacks on representing Pasteur as a grand-father were directed at Bonnat. Olmer criticized Bonnat for painting Pasteur as a grand-father because he did not think this would be the best representation for the future. He wrote that the portrait:

nous montre le grand savant sous l'aspect aimable et familial d'un papa gâteau, heureux de montrer sa petite-fille. C'est une gloire aussi d'avoir de beaux petits-enfants; mais elle est peut-être un peu trop partagée, et ce n'est pas sous cet aspect que la postérité se représentera l'homme qui a attaché son nom à la guérison de la rage.¹²⁰

¹¹⁸ For a discussion of how nineteenth-century art critics believed Bonnat's realism fulfilled Republican aims, see Luxenberg, pp. 130-131.

¹¹⁹ William Walton, *Chefs-d'oeuvres de l'Exposition Universelle de Paris, 1889*, (Paris, 1889), p. 102.

¹²⁰ Olmer, p. 76.

Olmer believed that Pasteur's representation as a scientist was best for posterity even though he also commended the glory of grandparenting. After the defeat of the French in the Franco-Prussian war, there was great fear surrounding the depopulation of France and the decrease in male children. Therefore, the ability to have children was regarded as essential to the future progress and safety of France.¹²¹ Despite the cultural status and respect given to grandfathers as family leaders, they nonetheless symbolized age, aging, and, inevitably, death. The figure of the grandfather simultaneously exemplified the strength and vulnerability of masculinity; he was the ultimate figure of wisdom and family dominance, yet his power was constantly threatened by time and bodily deterioration.

Some critics described the representation of Pasteur's body in Bonnat's portrait as impaired and sick. Henry Fèvre wrote that:

M. Bonnat a peint un Pasteur théâtral, la main sur la tête de sa petite fille, un Pasteur qui ne ressemble même pas; sa peau est comme huilée, et on redoute pour lui la jaunisse;... M. Pasteur n'a pas du tout cet air fatal et pontifiant de don Quichotte du microbe dont M. Bonnat l'a empalé... M. A. Edelfelt a certainement enforcé M. Bonnat dans la peinture du célèbre désenrageur. Son Pasteur est plus bonhomme, plus fouillé, plus animé, dans son laboratoire, flairant des fioles, en pleine investigation scientifique; la tête ressort aussi énergiquement que celle du premier sans la fausseté d'ombre ni tous ses ridicules de teintes malades.¹²²

For Fèvre, it was the colours used by Bonnat that left Pasteur jaundiced and gave the painting its sickly air. Perhaps Fèvre criticized Bonnat for painting Pasteur as a sick man because Bonnat's portrait showed a private side of Pasteur that was often denied in public. Pasteur's health had always been fragile. He had his first stroke, or cerebral haemorrhage, at age forty-five, thus permanently impairing his speech, walk and manual dexterity. As a personal friend of Pasteur and his family, Bonnat must have been aware of the scientist's physical ailments. Geison has claimed that Pasteur's visible aging and illness contributed to his public support as people saw him as a sympathetic figure, describing him as quiet, melancholic and serious, rather than as a highly competitive elitist professional. Geison supports his argument by making reference to a contemporary description of Pasteur:

Weary, traversed with deep furrows, the skin and beard both white, his hair still thick, and nearly always covered with a black cap; the broad forehead wrinkled, seamed with the scars of genius, the mouth slightly drawn by paralysis, but full of

¹²¹ For an account of medical beliefs that contributed to public fears of depopulation, Robert Nye (1984).

¹²² Fèvre, p. 33.

kindness, all the more expressive of pity for the sufferings of others, as it appears lined by personal sorrow; and above all, the living thought which still flashes from the eyes beneath the deep shadow of the brow - this is Pasteur as he appeared to me: a conqueror, who will someday become a legend, whose glory is as incalculable as the good he has accomplished.¹²³

As is evident in this text, Pasteur's physical ailments appeared to be caused by his own genius and generosity towards others. Although Geison provides textual examples to show the ways in which the scientist's aging and sick body helped construct Pasteur as an all-giving humanitarian saint, the Salon reviews show that visible representations of a sick Pasteur were not welcome in 1886.

The sickly feeling described by many Salon critics was attributed to Bonnat's palette as they believed that the painting's colors did not create a sense of warmth and robust health. The dark tones and pale figures painted by Bonnat create a sense of eerie distance between Pasteur and his granddaughter, Camille. Pasteur and Camille are unsmiling and serious, stiff and formally dressed. They gaze out at the viewer, their relationship to one another only revealed by the grip of the young girl's white fingers around her grandfather's swollen and purple-ish thumb, by the weight of her small body pressed against his dark uniform, and by his hand which rests on her shoulder. The darkness of the background and Pasteur's attire contrasts with the paleness of their skin. Pasteur's solid clothed body makes his flesh appear ephemeral and transparent. One journalist described Pasteur in this painting as "un peu croquemitaine."¹²⁴ Paul Lambert also criticized Bonnat's colours, particularly as used in the depiction of the granddaughter's skin. He wrote, "La pauvre jeune fille a la figure et les mains passées au jus de tabac. Tendres couleurs de l'enfance!"¹²⁵ That the child's skin colour and general depiction was odd was also noted in *Journals des Arts*, where the critic claimed that, "La petite fille n'a rien de bien enfantin et les tons de sa figures ont le même accent accusé que ceux du visage de son grand-père."¹²⁶ Bonnat's ghostly and serious representation of Pasteur was seen as being transferred onto Camille. Rather than having a healthy childhood glow, the girl's skin was considered stained and dirty. Such adjectives seemed more appropriate for describing the skin of a poor child rather than that of a well-looked-after upper-class girl. Although critics focused on the rendering of her deathly and dirty skin, Pasteur's granddaughter is the most colorful and decorative part of Bonnat's canvas.

¹²³ Percy F., and Grace C. Frankland, *Pasteur* (New York, 1898), pp. 209-210 as cited in Geison p. 271.

¹²⁴ Paul Gsell, "Pasteur Intime", *Revue Encyclopédique*, 14 January 1895, p. 20.

¹²⁵ Paul Lambert, *Le Salon de 1886* (Paris, 1886), p. 18.

¹²⁶ "Le Salon de 1886", Salon Review, *Journal des Arts*, 26 May, 1886.

In contrast to Pasteur's black suit, which was the universal uniform of most professional men, Camille's unique attire visibly exhibits social status. The gentle creases of her shiny light blue dress, the minute lace details of her sleeves, the tiny white flowers that cover her skirt, her neatly-parted blond hair and the tiny gold ring on her right hand all symbolize the wealth and order of the Pasteur family. Despite the visual codes exhibited by dress, many critics nonetheless focused on Pasteur's physiognomy in order to understand and describe the scientist.

Paul Lambert criticized Bonnat for showing Pasteur as a blind old man. He wrote that, "Ce portrait qui, à première vue, a l'aire d'être celui d'un aveugle conduit par une jeune fille, est certainement un des plus faibles du Salon."¹²⁷ The blindness of Pasteur was further emphasized many pages later when Lambert compared it to a painting by M. Landelle, writing that, "*L'Aveugle*, de M. Landelle, me fait l'effet d'une seconde édition du portrait de M. Pasteur par M. Bonnat, avec la différence que l'aveugle de M. Landelle a l'air d'y voir clair, tandis que le portrait de M. Bonnat ressemble à un aveugle."¹²⁸

Bonnat's Pasteur is not represented with an engaging gaze: he is shown looking to the side. The heavy bags under his eyes make him look tired and appear to impair his sight. In contrast to Pasteur, the granddaughter is shown with an attentive and questioning look. Despite the frivolity of her puffy blue dress and the frailty of her fingers and wrists, two large eyes emerge from the shadows of her brow, fixed forward upon the viewer. Although Bonnat painted her leaning against her grandfather, her attentive stare provides her with a power not pictorially given to Pasteur. Despite the smallness of her body, particularly in comparison to Pasteur, Camille appears to be sheltering the scientist's body, perhaps even, as Lambert proposed, leading him. By painting Pasteur without the tools of his discoveries and outside of his workspace, Pasteur's body could not easily display the ideal masculinity and strength that was required of a national hero and man of science.

Describing Pasteur as blind was significant because it underscored the importance of visibility in modern science and revealed the shortcomings of the human body in the face of new optical equipment such as the camera. As indicated by the confines of fitted suits and cramped laboratory spaces, science was not regarded as a physical pursuit but was rather defined by its dependence upon visual observation and mental contemplation. Visual observation was considered essential for scientific study, as is evident in the

¹²⁷ Lambert, p. 18.

¹²⁸ Lambert, p. 45.

plethora of tools and new technologies of vision, such as microscopes, which were often included in portraits of scientists, such as those by Edelfelt and Gsell. Although visual observation was understood as a route to truth, these emerging technologies of vision also undermined the human eye by revealing its fallibilities. New scientific beliefs, such as the germ theory, attempted to prove that the invisible existed through laboratory experimentation rather than through visibility. Laboratory science rather than human observation became the path to truth and knowledge. Yet despite the technological advancements and scientific theories that opened up the body and the world to new forms of inquiry, the majority of medical and pseudo-scientific discourse remained focused on the body's exterior and stressed visibility, as this approach was the most accessible to those without scientific training or equipment.

In contrast to Bonnat, Edelfelt painted Pasteur as an active scientist. Pasteur's steadfast stare, accentuated by his glasses and the microscope on the table, displays the crucial role of visual observation for the scientific method. In Edelfelt's portrait, Pasteur's gaze is focused on the spine of a diseased rabbit air-drying in a glass jar: the source of the attenuated rabies virus that was added to a sterile broth in order to make a vaccine. It was the act of air-drying the rabid rabbit spinal cord that eventually led to the discovery of a vaccine, and Pasteur wanted himself identified with this new scientific procedure. Significantly, it was Doctor Roux and not Pasteur who first experimented with rabid spinal cords in this way.¹²⁹ As recorded by Adrien Loir, one of Pasteur's assistants, Pasteur came across Roux's experiments and copied them, giving Roux no credit in coming up with the discovery.¹³⁰ In contrast to Loir's account, which discusses the interactions between Pasteur and his assistants, Edelfelt's portrait presents Pasteur as an independent scientist who is solely responsible for the cure. Not surprisingly, it was Pasteur's decision to include the glass with the rabid spine. Edelfelt described Pasteur's involvement with the portrait in a letter to his mother in June 1885:

Pasteur se dit très satisfait. Le vieil original est très intéressé, propose des changements etc... Comme il a peint lui-même, il sait parler d'art. Il m'a fait enlever la bouteille de microbes et à la place mettre dans sa main un grand ballon de verre avec à l'intérieur un morceau de la moelle épinière d'un chien suspendue à un fil. Le vieux dit que c'est quelque chose dont on n'a pas encore connaissance, mais qui va avoir une grande importance plus tard.¹³¹

¹²⁹ For an account of this experiment, see Dubré, p. 428.

¹³⁰ Adrien Loir, *À l'Ombre de Pasteur* (Paris, 1938), p. 66.

¹³¹ Letter from Edelfelt to his mother, 17 June 1885, in *Rappelez-Vous l'Arboisien*, pp. 52-53. It is likely that Edelfelt mistakenly claimed that the spine belonged to a dog rather than a rabbit as these experiments were not performed on dog spines.

Pasteur's decision to have Edelfelt include the rabbit spine in the painting reveals the scientist's own desire to propagate his scientific beliefs and exhibit his role in the discovery of a vaccine for rabies. It also shows a moment in which the history of a discovery was visually created by its realistic representation in paint. The personal and professional ambitions and desires of portraitists and their sitters show the unreliability of realism's truth claims. Although Edelfelt's letter and portrait appear to attest to the 'reality' and 'sincerity' of Pasteur's key role in creating a vaccine, other historical accounts, such as that by Loir, undermine such declarations, and show the vulnerability of the claims to truth made by portraiture and realist formal strategies, as well as by esteemed painters and scientists. The conflicting historical sources – textual and visual – reveal how histories are constructed as true or false based on the languages, styles, genres and materials used in their creation, as well as the social trust put into artists as recorders of history.

As is evident in one of Edelfelt's letters from April 1885, Pasteur was already discussing the possibility of a cure for rabies as early as this date even though the first human was not injected with the vaccine until 6 July 1885, and the public announcement of a rabies vaccine was not made to the Academie de Médecine until October 1885. Edelfelt wrote that, "Pasteur est en train de faire la plus grande découverte de sa vie: trouver le vaccin contre la rage."¹³² Although rabies only claimed roughly fifty lives per year, it held a prominent position in the public imagination because of its violent symptoms and impending death. As a disease that infected the central nervous system, rabies victims were in great pain and suffered multiple seizures, paralyses, and hallucinations. As is shown in images in the public press, rabies victims were thought to act like animals, often salivating profusely and biting at others (Fig. 36).¹³³ It was the public fear of rabies that drew so much attention to Pasteur's work despite the relative few who would be affected by the cure.

Although Edelfelt painted Pasteur looking at a rabid rabbit spine, rabies itself was not visible. The rabies virus was not discovered until after Pasteur's death, regardless of the many efforts of Pasteur and his assistants to isolate it. Yet despite the invisibility of

¹³² Letter from Edelfelt to his mother, 23 April, 1885, in *Rappelez-Vous l'Arboisien*, p. 50.

¹³³ For a discussion of public understandings of rabies see Kathleen Kete, "La Rage and the Bourgeoisie: The Cultural Context of Rabies in the French Nineteenth Century", *Representations*, 22, Spring 1988, pp. 89-107, and Bert Hansen, "America's First Medical Breakthrough: How Popular Excitement about a French Rabies Cure in 1885 Raised New Expectations for Medical Progress", *The American Historical Review*, 103, 2, April 1998, pp. 373-418.

rabies, the ability to see the invisible was essential not only to Pasteur's earlier successes but also to his identity as a scientist. Pasteur's early work, particularly on fermentation and anthrax, supported and propagated germ theory. Although John Waller argues that Pasteur's contribution to germ theory was the product of international scientific debates, the chemist was nonetheless regarded as the discoverer of germ theory in the French popular imagination.¹³⁴ Pasteur's believed ability to see the invisible is staged in Edelfelt's portrait: only Pasteur 'sees' the curative potential of rabid rabbit spines. Without his vision and insight, it was believed that rabies would continue to kill.

Showing Off: Portraiture, Nationalism, and Commerce

Edelfelt's portrait of Pasteur was created a year before its display at the Salon. Edelfelt, a young Finnish artist who came to Paris to study under Jean-Léon Gérôme, had become a friend of Pasteur's son, Jean-Baptist, an aspiring writer and art critic. Edelfelt created multiple portraits of the Pasteur family, beginning with his portrait of Jean-Baptiste, which Louis Pasteur commissioned in 1881. As is evident in letters written by Edelfelt to Pasteur, Edelfelt asked Pasteur if he could paint his portrait in 1885. Pasteur was very willing and the portrait was made and completed between April and June 1885. As Edelfelt's letters show, Pasteur was a willing sitter and had a keen interest in painting:

Il était très gentil et m'a promis qu'en tant que modèle, il n'allait pas me décevoir, de plus il s'intéresse à la peinture parce qu'à l'âge de seize ans, il voulait absolument devenir peintre et que pour cela il se consacra durant plusieurs étés à cet art noble. Il a peint plusieurs portraits au pastel. Une vieille dame avait dit de lui pendant ces longues années où il ne fit qu'étudier et où l'on ne voyait pas le résultat de ses efforts 'Pourquoi ne s'en est-il pas tenu à la peinture? Il aurait pu s'y faire un nom.'¹³⁵

Edelfelt's notes show that Pasteur sat for him many times and that Pasteur offered advice on how to make the portrait more scientific. Pasteur's familiarity with the arts and previous desire to be a painter were well known.

Early letters written by Pasteur to his parents exhibit his interest in art, portraiture in particular, as the teenage Pasteur wrote about the portraits he had executed of family members, friends, and teachers. Although Pasteur stopped producing artworks when he

¹³⁴ For a general account of the history of germ theory, see John Waller, *The Discovery of the Germ* (Cambridge, 2002).

¹³⁵ Lettre from Edelfelt to his mother, 27 April 1885, *Rappelez-Vous l'Arboisie*, p. 51.

moved to Paris in 1842, many of his pastel portraits hung in his residence (Fig. 37).¹³⁶ As is evident by the portrait of Pasteur's father, Pasteur's pastels were primarily traditional head and shoulder compositions, with the subjects' bodies depicted against a coloured background. The public's knowledge of these works is evident in various nineteenth-century sources. The art critic, Durand-Gréville, wrote in 1888 upon seeing a portrait that Pasteur made of his friend, Marcou, that:

Beaucoup de nos peintre médaillés au salon n'ont jamais dessiné ni modelé une bouche avec autant de justesse. Personne ne regretta que Pasteur ait choisi la carrière scientifique. Mais s'il avait voulu, il serait devenu quelqu'un parmi les peintres et, qui sait? Peut-être un très grand peintre.¹³⁷

Pasteur's artistic talents were also discussed in the *Album Gonnon – Iconographie Médicale, 1895-1908*. This book was one of the first books to address nineteenth-century medical collections and iconography. In relation to Pasteur, it claimed that: "...vers l'âge de 16 ans, Pasteur avait songé à se faire peintre. On possède de lui des pastels si remarquables par la précision du coup d'oeil, qu'on a peine à croire qu'ils sont sortis de la main d'un adolescent."¹³⁸ In this book, Pasteur's artistic interests are discussed along with those of Doctor Paul Richer, a doctor at the Salpêtrière who later became the head of the Académie des Beaux-Arts, and Doctor Charcot, head of the Salpêtrière, in order to show the role that men of science had in the production of artworks. Pasteur's interest in the arts was further secured through his appointment by Napoleon III as the first professor of geology, physics and applied chemistry at the École des Beaux-Arts in 1863. Teaching there until 1867, when he was called to work on the silkworm blight, Pasteur's work concentrated on finding the chemical compounds in paint in order to help with painting conservation. He argued that science had a role in the history of art because it was needed for paintings to survive. Pasteur's personal interest in the arts is also apparent in the letters written to his wife about his visit to the Dresden museum, his friendships with contemporary artists and men in the art world, such as Paul Dubois, Jean-Jacques Henner and Charles Blanc, his own commissioning of art works, and the active role he took in the production of portraits.¹³⁹

¹³⁶ For further information about Pasteur's artistic interests see Denise Wrotnowska, "Pasteur et l'art", *Médecine de France*, August 1955, pp. 9-16, M. Vallery-Radot, *Pasteur savant et artiste* (Paris, 1995) and R. Vallery-Radot, *Pasteur dessinateur et pastelliste (1836-1842)* (Paris, 1912).

¹³⁷ Durand-Gréville's article on Pasteur in *L'intermédiaire des chercheurs et des curieux*, 10 September, 1888, as cited in M. Vallery-Radot, *Pasteur savant et artiste*, p. 26.

¹³⁸ Gonnon, *Album Gonnon – Iconographie Médicale, 1895-1908*, (Lyon, n.d.), p. VII.

¹³⁹ For a discussion of Pasteur's personal relationships with men in the art world, see Weisberg pp. 584-586.

Edelfelt first exhibited the portrait of Pasteur in Helsinki in the summer of 1885 at an exhibition organized for Tsar Alexandre III.¹⁴⁰ Bertel Hintze has claimed that Edelfelt's painting became a cultural weapon for the Finnish public because it was believed to exhibit the strength and sophistication of Finland as an independent nation. Significant social and artistic status were given to young Scandinavian artists who studied in France. Erik Werenskiöld, a young Norwegian writer, stated in 1886 that:

We went to Paris, learned from the Frenchmen's advanced, logical reasoning; understood that we should stick to nature...With Naturalism a national art must result...What is the basis for Naturalism? The view that when an artist places himself in front of a part of nature and recreates it as well as he can, he creates a better work of art than if he paints all kinds of grand scenes from his head with or without some study of nature...If you are still in doubt, go to Paris and see! All French art is permeated with Naturalism. You are surely familiar with such names as Corot, Millet, Courbet, Meissonnier and Bonnat?¹⁴¹

As is evident in Werenskiöld's text, logic, progress, reason and nationalism were intricately linked to representations of visible reality. Siulolovao Challons-Lipton has examined how young Scandinavian artists, like Edelfelt, were advised to follow the French example in order to produce a modern and nationalist art because they considered the academies of their native countries to be old and out-dated. Scandinavian pupils considered Bonnat a liberal and modern teacher.¹⁴² Although Bonnat has often been considered representative of academic art and commercial success, particularly in twentieth-century art history (he ~~worked~~^{taught} at the Académie, was elected to the Salon Jury in 1876, and sold his work for roughly ten times the price of those associated with Impressionism during the nineteenth century), he was also known for praising the role of public opinion above that of the Académie, voting in support of Courbet at the 1868 Salon, and being praised as the greatest artist since Courbet by Zola in 1878. The inability to securely categorize Bonnat is evident in Zola's criticism, as only a year later, Zola called Bonnat Courbet's slave.¹⁴³ This inability to classify also shows the shifting and conflicting definitions of realism as well as the multiple, and often contradictory, characteristics with which it was associated: it was used to describe both Bonnat's smooth and detailed paintings of Republican leaders as well as Courbet's roughly worked

¹⁴⁰Bertel Hintze, "Albert Edelfelt", unpublished manuscript in Musée Pasteur archives, Edelfelt Dossier, pp. 184-189.

¹⁴¹Erik Werenskiöld, *Aftenposten*, 8 November 1886, Oslo, as cited in Siulolovao Challons-Lipton, *The Scandinavian Pupils of the Atelier Bonnat 1867-1894* (New York, 2001), pp. 127-128.

¹⁴²Challons-Lipton, pp. 127-129.

¹⁴³Challons-Lipton, pp. 17-23. For Zola's criticism of Bonnat, see Zola, *Documents littéraires, études et portraits* (Paris, 1881) which contains his reviews of the 1878 and 1879 Salons.

portrayals of peasant life. Regardless of his categorization, Bonnat was a successful artist critically and monetarily, and therefore served as a role model for young artists such as Edelfelt.

Edelfelt was able to construct and display his identity as a young and fashionable artist by painting Pasteur in a manner recognizable as realist. He created a sense of reality through intricate details, specialized equipment, smooth brushstrokes, the rendering of daylight and a recognizable portrayal of Pasteur. By representing Pasteur alone at work in his laboratory, Edelfelt produced an image that implied that he was privy to the secretive scientist and his experiments. The work also suggested that Edelfelt shared the same company as men like Bonnat and could therefore warrant commissions by prominent individuals and the state. Like the rabbit spine that displayed Pasteur's alleged discovery of a vaccine for rabies, the portrait itself served as a record of Edelfelt's time with Pasteur, a public announcement of his interactions with the famous scientist, and a display of his skills as a painter. When Edelfelt wrote a letter about the portrait's exhibition at the Salon, claiming that, "Les meilleurs portraits qu'on fait, ne sont en général jamais commandés ni payés, mais sont faits pour la gloire," it is likely that he was addressing both Pasteur's glory and his own.

Like Edelfelt's painting, Bonnat's portrait contributed to Pasteur's celebrity and to his own. Bonnat was a very popular artist, as is evident in *Artistes Contemporains des Pays de Guyenne, Béarn, Saintonge et Languedoc* from 1889:

Quand vous parcourez le Salon, aux jours de foule, et que vous suivez le courant où il vous mène, c'est-à-dire devant les oeuvres qui ont la vogue, qui 'font recette', et que tout le monde, depuis le plus naïf des visiteurs jusqu'aux connoisseurs les plus raffinés, veut avoir vues, un des premiers tableaux devant lequel le flot vous poussera sera un portrait de Bonnat.

Vous l'apercevrez, tout en entrant, dans la salle où il se trouve; par-dessus la mer houleuse des têtes et des chapeaux, vous distinguerez quelque figure fortement dessinée, solidement peinte, se présentant avec un relief à friser le trompe-l'oeil, et écrasant autour d'elle, de ses tons robustes et de son modelé puissant, tout ce qui l'entoure; du plus loin que vous la verrez, pour peu que la manière des principaux artistes contemporains vous soit connue, vous n'hésitez pas, vous direz: 'C'est un Bonnat!' et vous ne vous tromperez point, car ici la marque de fabrique saute aux yeux, la griffe de l'ouvrier se traduit à chaque touche.¹⁴⁴

Bonnat's works produced a spectacle at the Salons as the public simultaneously praised his painterly technique and enjoyed his representations of celebrity bodies. Bonnat had a

¹⁴⁴ Louis Bauzon, Paul Berthelot, Paul Bonnefon, et al., *Artistes Contemporains des Pays de Guyenne, Béarn, Saintonge et Languedoc* (Bordeaux, 1889), p. 8.

long waiting list of those who wished to be portrayed by him as his fame was believed to confer status upon the sitter. An article published in *The Illustrated American* in 1890 claimed that:

...Till they have seen themselves on Bonnat's canvas, statesmen doubt their popularity, authors question their genius, actresses tremble for their laurels, millionaires suspect their influence...To have been painted by Bonnat is to have proved yourself somebody; to have had the seal set on your hard-won reputation; to have won, as it were, official recognition of your merit, your weight, your talent, your wealth.¹⁴⁵

Bonnat's identity as one of the main painters of the Republic instilled his sitters with historical and national importance. Bonnat was known as an ardent nationalist. He had fought against the Prussians in the 1870-71 war, and in the following years painted portraits of some of the most recognized republicans. His 1876 portrait of Adolphe Thiers, president of the Third Republic from 1870-1873, brought Bonnat national fame (Fig. 38). Bonnat's portraits of famous French men and women were very familiar to the public not only because of their display at the annual Salons but because Bonnat sold the rights to reproduce these works to photographers, etchers and lithographers.¹⁴⁶ Not surprisingly, the young Edelfelt was nervous knowing that his painting would be exhibited at the same Salon as Bonnat's portrait. He wrote in a letter to his mother on 30 November 1885 that Bonnat would give Pasteur "l'air propriétaire" and that he would paint "une redingote bien meilleure que la mienne."¹⁴⁷ Yet Bonnat did not include his portrait of Pasteur in the Salon competition, claiming that it would be unfair because he was on the Jury. Nonetheless, Bonnat's portrait was placed in a more prominent position at the Salon than Edelfelt's because the Finish artist's work was hung in the separate section for foreign painters.

Bonnat's portraits helped construct a republican iconography because his paintings were understood to contribute to the history of France by serving as historical documents for future viewers:

On a dit de M. Bonnat, pour atténuer l'éloge et la gloire qui lui sont dus, que son art tenait de la prose. Ne chicanons pas sur les termes: acceptons le mot de prose, puisque prose il y a; mais croyons bien au moins, pour nous en tenir à son admirable et magistrale galerie de portrait contemporains, que la postérité ne s'en plaindra point, car cette prose est singulièrement énergique et virile, nette,

¹⁴⁵ "French Painters 'Chez Eux' III", *The Illustrated American* (New York), III, September 27 1890, pp. 609-613 as cited in Luxenberg, p. 188.

¹⁴⁶ Luxenberg, p.182.

¹⁴⁷ Letter from Edelfelt to his mother, 30 November 1885, in *Rappelez-Vous l'Arboisien*, p. 54.

expressive et sonore: elle a le parler haut, ferme et clair; elle a l'autorité, elle s'impose. Prose donc, enfin, si l'on veut; mais c'est la prose de l'histoire.¹⁴⁸

As is evident in this text from 1889, Bonnat constructed his sitters as historically significant because his portraits provided clear, sound and virile representations of contemporary men. Bonnat wrote of the ability of portraiture, particularly that by Rembrandt, to bring historical moments back to life in his preface to Marcel Nicolle's *Rembrandt Aux Expositions d'Amsterdam et de Londres*, when he declared that, "Ce qui frappe chez Rembrandt, c'est la puissance, la force et l'éclat. Il représente la vie dans toute son intensité. On voit ses personnages, on cause avec eux, il ressuscite et ranime toute une époque."¹⁴⁹ Bonnat further praised Rembrandt's portraits by claiming that, "Rembrandt possède déjà à fond la science du portrait. Il connaît la construction de la tête humaine mieux que personne."¹⁵⁰ For Bonnat, it was the science of Rembrandt's portraits that contributed to their ability to revive history. Bonnat used the word 'science' to indicate Rembrandt's knowledge of human anatomy. That Bonnat wanted to align himself with Rembrandt and this scientific approach to art is evident by his copying of the Dutch master's famous anatomy lesson of Doctor Tulp. Realism was understood as the best aesthetic for creating paintings that would serve as historical documents not only because it was aligned with truth and objectivity, but because it was understood as modern, democratic and scientific. This is evident in *La Peinture au XIXème Siècle*, written by Léonce Bénédict, the curator at the Musée Luxembourg during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century:

D'autre part le mouvement réaliste s'accroît dans un sens démocratique et populaire, qui suit la marche des progrès politiques et avec un caractère inédit de méthode et l'objectivité dans l'observation, qui est en concordance avec le développement intense de l'esprit scientifique.¹⁵¹

Both Bénédict and Bonnat praised art that followed what they saw as scientific principles, seeing it as necessary for the production of historically significant work. They both linked art and science by praising realism as the aesthetic that provided true-to-life representations of important contemporary figures. For Bénédict, realism was not only

¹⁴⁸ Bauzon, et al., *Artistes Contemporains des Pays de Guyenne*, p. 12.

¹⁴⁹ Léon Bonnat, "Préface" to Marcel Nicolle, *Rembrandt Aux Expositions d'Amsterdam et de Londres* (Paris, 1899), p. I.

¹⁵⁰ Bonnat, p. III.

¹⁵¹ Léonce Bénédict, *La Peinture au XIXe siècle d'après les chefs-d'oeuvres des maîtres et les meilleurs tableaux des principaux artistes* (Paris, n.d.), pp. XI-XII.

the agent that bound art and science together, but it was also the aesthetic of democracy and modern French political progress.¹⁵²

This interconnection is also evident in Bonnat's portrait of Pasteur. Bonnat's realism set up a conjunction between Pasteur and French national pride: the progress of modern science was given historical import through its realistic representation by a known republican artist. Bonnat's portrait added to emerging republican iconography as it presented Pasteur as a heroic figure, suitably decorated by the red pin of the *légion d'honneur*. As Christiane Sinding has pointed out, the public celebration and representation of France's 'great' contemporary men took on a new momentum after the 1885 state funeral for Victor Hugo.¹⁵³ Although the glorification of 'great men' replaced the adoration of monarchs after the French Revolution, state funerals were limited to politicians and those connected to the military until the 1878 state funeral for the physiologist Claude Bernard.¹⁵⁴ Significantly, the number of scientists nationally commemorated rose greatly during the Third Republic. From 1878 until 1907, four state funerals were held for men of science (Bernard, Paul Bert, Pasteur and Marcellin Berthelot) in comparison with only two writers (Hugo and Ernest Renan).¹⁵⁵ The celebration of scientists was used as a way to honour the French nation as politicians transformed the characteristics attributed to science, such as rationality, truth, and objectivity, into a shared value system that was believed to unite and guarantee the survival of France.

Pasteur became a symbol of France, particularly after the Franco-Prussian war. Pasteur linked science and nationalism by arguing that France had lost the war because it had not spent enough money on scientific pursuits. Although he had been sympathetic to republicanism during the Revolution of 1848, he was generally conservative. He openly admired Napoleon Bonaparte and fostered a relationship with Louis Bonaparte, to whom he dedicated his book on wine. In 1868, Louis Bonaparte promoted Pasteur to commander of the *Légion d'honneur*. In 1875, after the 1870 abdication of Napoleon, Pasteur ran for Senate as a conservative for his hometown of Arbois, standing on the platform of nationalism and science. Although he lost the election, possibly because he

¹⁵² For a discussion of the relationship between realism, republicanism and science, see Levin, particularly pp. 37-41.

¹⁵³ Christiane Sinding, "Claude Bernard and Louis Pasteur: Constructing images through Public Commemorations", *Osiris*, 2, 14, 1999, pp. 62-63.

¹⁵⁴ Sinding, p. 64.

¹⁵⁵ Sinding, p. 64.

did not fully deny his associations with the Second Empire, Pasteur was nonetheless regarded as a good republican, particularly after 1870 when he avidly supported France in the wake of the Franco-Prussian war. Pasteur stayed in France after the war despite many offers to work at foreign universities, expressed anti-Prussian sentiment (“Hatred towards Prussia. Revenge! Revenge!”), returned an honorary doctoral degree from the University of Bonn, and, upon his deathbed, refused the Prussian Order of Merit.¹⁵⁶ A cartoon published in *Le Rire* in 1895 also showed Pasteur’s fervent nationalism. In the work, he is shown inoculating himself against the orders of Prussia (Fig. 39). Although Pasteur’s personal politics helped shape his public persona, representations of Pasteur presented him as France’s greatest patriot and saviour. As Doctor August Lutaud, a critic of Pasteur’s work on rabies, wrote in *Pasteur et la rage* in 1887, “In France, one can be an anarchist, a communist or a nihilist, but not an anti-Pastorian. A simple question of science has been made into a question of patriotism.”¹⁵⁷

Science and nationalism were bound through the figure of Pasteur and articulated through realistic renderings of his body. Bonnat’s identity as the portraitist of the *grands hommes* of the republic further emphasized the national importance of Pasteur and his portrait, as well as constructed both scientist and artist as patriots. Yet unlike Edelfelt’s painting, Bonnat’s representation of Pasteur was a commissioned portrait. Although it formed public identities for Bonnat and Pasteur, it also exhibited the import of the man who commissioned the work. Bonnat was hired by J.C Jacobsen, the owner of the Carlsberg brewing company in Denmark, to make Madame Pasteur a portrait of her husband. Although it is unknown why Jacobsen commissioned Bonnat, it is likely because Bonnat was a well-known portraitist of the Third Republic and because he socialized in the same circles as Pasteur. Pasteur’s friendship with Bonnat is evident in a letter Pasteur wrote to his son, expressing his dismay at Bonnat for not having told him that Jacobsen had hired him to paint his portrait.¹⁵⁸ Pasteur began sitting for Bonnat in early 1886. By March 1886, Bonnat’s portrait of Pasteur was on display in the artist’s studio. In a letter from 11 March 1886, Pasteur wrote to Bonnat that Jean-Jacques Henner, who was also a part of their social circle and who had also painted portraits of Pasteur and his family, had seen the portrait:

¹⁵⁶ Pasteur, *Correspondance* (Paris, 1940), pp. 491-492. For an account of Pasteur’s political work, see Geison, pp. 43-45.

¹⁵⁷ Doctor August Lutaud, *Pasteur et la rage* (Paris, 1887) as translated in Geison, p. vi.

¹⁵⁸ Pasteur, *Correspondance*, Letter from Pasteur to his son Jean-Baptiste, 25 September 1885, p. 41.

Mon Cher Bonnat,

Je copie:

<<Je viens de voir votre portrait chez Bonnat. Il est magnifique et c'est une de ses plus belles oeuvres. La petite fille est ravissante comme pose et ressemble à sa mère. Je suis bien heureux pour vous et je vous en félicite. De tout Coeur votre tout dévoué, Henner >>

Je n'ajoute rien sinon que j'ose penser comme Henner et que je vais envoyer la lettre à mon fils pour M. Jacobsen. Cet homme bien écrit qu'il n'ose pas réclamer à Bonnat une photographie.

Bien à vous, mon cher grand maître.

L. Pasteur¹⁵⁹

These letters reveal a familiarity and warmth between Pasteur, Henner and Bonnat, and also show Pasteur and Henner's fondness for Bonnat's portrait. Henner's ability to see Pasteur's daughter's likeness in the image of Camille further exhibits the personal connection between these men, as Pasteur had hired Henner to paint portraits of his family members many years earlier. The friendly contact between Henner and Pasteur is also evident in a small portrait of Pasteur that Henner made and gave to Pasteur as a gift to accompany his portrait of Pasteur's daughter (Fig. 40, 41). Like Bonnat's portrait, Henner's painting portrays Pasteur as family man as it works as a companion portrait to that Henner painted of the chemist's daughter.

Although Bonnat's portrait was a gift for Madame Pasteur from Jacobsen and was painted by a friend of the chemist, both of which imply that the portrait was an intimate and personal object, it also had a very public and professional function that served the needs of the Jacobsen family. The Jacobsens were a prominent Danish family because of their successful business and wealth. Pasteur's son, Jean-Baptiste, knew the Jacobsens because he was the *secrétaire auprès de l'Ambassade de France* in Copenhagen.¹⁶⁰ On 12 April 1885, Jean-Baptiste wrote to his father that J.C Jacobsen wanted to try Pasteur's filtering system, the *filtre de porcelaine Chamberland*, that Pasteur had invented with his colleague Charles Chamberland. Pasteur had patented this bacterial filter that was used in the manufacturing and preserving of wine, vinegar and beer. Pasteur sent the Jacobsens a new model of the filter and, shortly after, the Jacobsens commissioned the portrait by Bonnat. The gift was not only in thanks for the filter but also reflected Jacobsen's indebtedness to Pasteur's scientific work. Unlike most brewers during the nineteenth

¹⁵⁹ Pasteur, *Correspondance*, Letter from Pasteur to Bonnat, 11 March 1886, p. 62.

¹⁶⁰ For a discussion of the close relationship between the Pasteurs and the Jacobsens, as well as an account of the commissioning of Bonnat's portrait, see Denise Wrotnowska, "Une amitié de savants, Pasteur et Jacobsen" *Histoires des sciences médicales*, July-December 1970, pp. 137-139.

century, who produced beer by visually gauging when it appeared ready, Jacobsen followed Pasteur's example by considering the scientific problems associated with fermentation. In 1875, Jacobsen created a Carlsberg laboratory, divided into a department of chemistry and a department of physiology, in order to produce high quality, hygienic beer that was available year round.¹⁶¹ Pasteur's work ultimately enabled the Carlsberg company to expand and improve production, becoming the largest brewery in Europe. Bonnat's portrait linked Jacobsen with Pasteur, as a small plaque on the painting displayed the name of the famous brewer. As a form of advertising, this gave Carlsberg beer the safety and security associated with Pasteur's scientific practice. At a time when many doctors and scientists fought against the ads printed in the back of newspapers (as they believed these advertisements of quack remedies undermined the status and legitimacy of science), Bonnat's portrait, exhibited at the Salon, provided a subtle yet highly visible, commercial for both Carlsberg beer and Louis Pasteur.¹⁶²

The relationship between Pasteur and Jacobsen is exemplary of the links forming between Republicanism, science, commerce and art in the capitalist world order of late nineteenth-century Europe. Although France was often associated with its wine, beer came to be understood as a national symbol. The strength and character of a country became associated with beer as it reflected a country's industrial strength, scientific knowledge and wealth. Pasteur used beer to express his anti-Prussian sentiment in his 1876 book *Études sur la Bière; ses maladies, causes qui les provoquent, procédé pour la rendre inaltérable, avec une théorie nouvelle de la Fermentation* when he claimed that he wanted all beer made by his methods to be labelled as French in order to help France compete against Prussian breweries. He claimed that his interest in beer arose from France's defeat in 1870-71:

L'idée de ces recherches m'a été inspirée par nos malheurs. Je les ai entreprises aussitôt après la guerre de 1870 et poursuivies sans relâche depuis cette époque, avec la résolution de les mener assez loin pour marquer d'un progrès durable une industrie dans laquelle l'Allemagne nous est supérieure.¹⁶³

¹⁶¹ Most beer in northern Europe was only available on seasonally, as hot weather affected the bacteria in the beer. For an account of Pasteur's role in brewing during the nineteenth-century, see E.M. Sigsworth, "Science and the Brewing Industry, 1850-1900", *The Economic History Review*, 17, 3, 1965, pp. 536-550.

¹⁶² For a discussion of nineteenth-century French advertising, see Marc Martin, *Trois Siècle de publicité en France* (Paris, 1992).

¹⁶³ L. Pasteur, *Études sur la Bière; ses maladies, causes qui les provoquent, procédé pour la rendre inaltérable, avec une théorie nouvelle de la Fermentation* (Paris, 1876), p. vii.

Pasteur believed that it was through science, commerce and industry that France could achieve greatness and superiority over Prussia. His writing and public statements, along with Bonnat's portrait, exhibit the close bonds that were being formed between science and industry during the late-nineteenth century. Paster believed these bonds were crucial because private business was needed to fund scientific research, and in turn, industry could reap economic gains through scientific discoveries. Although Paster was the likely recipient of roughly ten percent of France's annual funding for scientific research, he also actively sought out private money, particularly from industrialists.¹⁶⁴ Paster's research had greatly helped French business, particularly the silk, farming, wine and beer industries, and therefore such business felt a need to contribute to his scientific causes. Furthermore, he insisted that the opening and running of the Paster Institute be financially supported not only by the money generated by the patented vaccines that emerged from his laboratory, but also by private and industrial donations.

The Jacobsen family also commissioned Paul Dubois to make a marble bust of Paster for themselves (Fig. 42). Displayed in Denmark and at both the 1880 and 1886 Paris Salons, the sculpture exhibited their economic and industrial debt to Paster as well as displayed their personal relationship with the chemist. Paster's desire to propagate both his own work and that of his artist and industrialist friends through art is evidenced by a letter he wrote his son-in-law before the 1880 Salon. He wrote:

Je voudrais que le nom de M. Jacobsen fût glorifié à côté de celui de Paul Dubois par un critique d'art autorisé. Vous êtes connu au journal *Le Temps* dont la revue du Salon est faite par un écrivain de talent, Paul Mantz. Il serait très désirable qu'en parlant de l'oeuvre de Paul Dubois, M.P. Mantz parlant de l'oeuvre de Paul Dubois, M.P. Mantz voulût bien raconter en quelques lignes l'origine du buste, signaler la générosité éclairée de ce riche industriel qui a consacré quinze cent mille franc à l'érection d'un laboratoire destiné aux progrès du brasseur.¹⁶⁵

As is evident from Paster's request, the chemist saw the Salon and Salon criticism as sites on which professional scientific, commercial and artistic identities could be created.

Upon Jacobsen's death, Paster asked Jacobsen's son, Carl, if a cast could be made of the bust. Although the portrait was of the scientist rather than the businessman, Paster's bronze copy of Dubois' bust served as a personal memento of Jacobsen. Displayed in Paster's home, it exhibited Paster's contribution to modern industry.

¹⁶⁴ For an account of Paster's funding, see Geison, pp. 40-42.

¹⁶⁵ Paster, letter to Vallery-Radot on 21 May 1880, *Correspondance*, pp. 135-136.

The Jacobsen and Pasteur families were tied through their mutual commitment to the propagation of modern French art. In 1888, Carl Jacobsen organized and funded an exhibition of French art at the Exposition of Industry, Agricultural and Nordic Arts in Copenhagen.¹⁶⁶ As is depicted in Peder Severin Krøyer's 1889 painting, *Le Comité de l'Exposition française à Copenhague 1888, présidé par L. Pasteur*, Jacobsen asked Pasteur to be the honorary president of the exposition (Fig. 43). In Krøyer's painting, Pasteur is shown sitting at a large meeting table, surrounded by prominent men, including Antonin Proust, the president of the exposition. This exhibition, along with Jacobsen and Pasteur's role in the show, was discussed in France. Pasteur wrote to Jacobsen that "tous nos artistes vous connaissent et parlent de vos libéralités avec de grands éloges et toutes sortes de sentiments reconnaissants,"¹⁶⁷ while Jules Claretie wrote in *Le Temps* that the show displayed "l'art français le plus élevé qui soit" and mentioned that Pasteur had given Jacobsen a bas-relief by the sculptor Perraud in order to honour their friendship, Jacobsen's late father, and his gratitude to Copenhagen.¹⁶⁸ The exhibition in Denmark showed how industry not only donated money to science and technology, but also actively supported the arts. Through the seemingly autonomous art world, scientific and industrial leaders could promote their 'goods'. Although this event promoted French art in Denmark and provided Jacobsen with an opportunity to acquire French art, it also advertised his family name and company internationally. The donation of artworks to public collections was understood as a way to contribute to national strength, as it not only displayed the greatness of national heroes, but also spread and encouraged national culture.¹⁶⁹

Unlike Bonnat's portrait, which was hung in Pasteur's home, both Edelfelt and Gsell's paintings were bought for French museums. The ministry of French culture asked Edelfelt for the portrait after the 1886 Salon, claiming that it would be exhibited at the Musée de Luxembourg and then at the Louvre (it ultimately ended up at the Sorbonne until 1922).¹⁷⁰ Although Edelfelt had originally intended to give the painting to Pasteur as a gift, it was decided that the painting would be bought by the State, and that Edelfelt,

¹⁶⁶ For a discussion of this exhibition, see Anne-Birgitte Fonsmark, *Manet, Gauguin, Rodin... Chef-d'oeuvre de la Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek de Copenhague*, exh.cat. Musée d'Orsay (Paris, 1995), pp. 2-3.

¹⁶⁷ Pasteur, January 1, 1888. *Correspondance*, IV, p. 235.

¹⁶⁸ Jules Claretie, *Le Temps*, 1 July 1890, as cited in Wrotnowska "Une amitié de savants", pp. 137-139.

¹⁶⁹ For a range of examinations of the relationship between French nationalism and the arts see June Hargrove and Neil McWilliam (eds) *Nationalism and French Visual Culture 1870-1914* (New Haven, 2005).

¹⁷⁰ Hintze, "Albert Edelfelt", p. 4.

with the help of the Finnish artist, Helene Schjerfbeck, would make a copy for Pasteur.¹⁷¹ The state acquisition and public display of Edelfelt's portrait both reinforced Pasteur's symbolic importance to the State and constructed Edelfelt as a prominent Parisian painter. A month after the 1886 Salon, Edelfelt was awarded the *légion d'honneur*.¹⁷²

Gsell's portrait was bought by Baron Alphonse de Rothschild during the 1886 Salon. As is evident in the Salon review in *L'Art*, Rothschild found the painting despite the fact that the painting was "toute au dernier rang de la salle XIX, si haut qu'elle est invisible. M. Alphonse de Rothschild a réussi cependant à l'y découvrir; il a vengé M. Lucien Laurent-Gsell du dédain de ses pairs en lui demandant le Laboratoire de M. Pasteur."¹⁷³ Rothschild donated the painting to the Musée des Beaux-Arts de Vannes in 1887 after great encouragement from Paul Leroi, the director of *L'Art*, who was asking that people donate artwork to provincial museums.¹⁷⁴ In June 1887, Alphonse and his brother, Nathaniel, donated many works to the museum in Vannes, which had recently been installed in the new Hôtel de Ville. By donating this work, Alphonse, like J.C. Jacobsen, Bonnat, Edelfelt and Gsell, exhibited his connection to Pasteur and his active role in the promotion of both French art and French science. Yet unlike Edelfelt and Bonnat's paintings, Gsell's work got little notice in the press; his portrait was not even considered a candidate in the quest for the quintessential image of Pasteur. The minimal Salon criticism about the painting infers that the painting's size and location at the Salon led to its invisibility, compounded by the fact that compositionally Pasteur was hard to see. The painting was more a generic laboratory scene than a portrait of a national hero. Therefore, it is not surprising that the following year Gsell created a big and bold entry for the Salon, representing Pasteur in the front row.¹⁷⁵

"Doctor Pasteur": Gsell's Portrait of Pasteur at the 1887 Salon

"On n'imagine pas le nombre des médecins dont le portrait figure au Salon," wrote the art critic Le Roux in his review of the 1887 Salon in *Le Temps*. "Comme M. Charcot, comme M. Péan, M. Pasteur a été peint dans sa clinique. On inocule sous ses

¹⁷¹ The original is currently at the Musée d'Orsay and the copy is at the Pasteur Institute.

¹⁷² Weisberg, p. 620.

¹⁷³ "Salon de 1886", *L'Art*, 14 June 1886, p. 251.

¹⁷⁴ Yvonne Le Garrec, "'Le 'Laboratoire de Pasteur' par L.L Gsell au Musée de Vannes", *Association des Anciens élèves de l'Institut Pasteur*, newsletter 2001, p. 57.

¹⁷⁵ Although I have not been able to find Gsell's painting, and therefore do not know the exact size, Walton described Gsell work, along with that by Brouillet: "These are very large canvases, with many figures the size of life or near it..." Walton, p. 88.

yeux un petit enfant; un grand Arabe attend son tour.”¹⁷⁶ Le Roux categorized Gsell’s portrait of Pasteur, titled *La vaccine de la rage au laboratoire de M. Pasteur*, as one of the many portraits of doctors at the Salon. He did not draw a distinction between Péan and Charcot as medical practitioners and Pasteur as a laboratory scientist. The three paintings, the three sitters and the three settings in which the men were depicted were all regarded as equivalent. The similarities between the portraits by Gervex, Brouillet and Gsell were also discussed by Roger Ballu in *L’illustration*. Although Ballu praised Gsell for his excellent intentions, he wrote that, “peut-être a-t-il joué de Malheur en livrant au public une Scène chez M. Pasteur l’année où M. Gervex et M. Brouillet exposaient des scènes analogues. Il est des comparaisons fatales qui sont préjudiciables.”¹⁷⁷ That numerous critics commented upon the paintings’ similarities is not surprising. Despite the paintings’ different narratives, the three artists relied on similar formal practices and iconographical precedents in order to construct images that celebrated modern male professionalism in the scientific arena. All three works are large-scale oil paintings of well-known professional men in their workplace. In all of the portraits, dark-suited, white-haired men are represented commanding the attention of a crowd, their faces lit by the daylight that falls through large windows. All three men have human beings as their objects of study: Péan is focused on a bare-breasted anesthetized woman, Charcot on a swooning hysterical woman, and Pasteur on a young squirming child and non-French men. Regardless of the professional differences between Péan and Charcot as men of medicine, and Pasteur as a chemist, the exhibition of these three portraits at the Salon united these men and their professions and served to propagate the social, cultural and historical status of these *grand hommes*.

Gsell’s painting *La vaccine de la rage au laboratoire de M. Pasteur* depicts various people who have come to be inoculated at Pasteur’s laboratory. To the right of the canvas stands Pasteur, holding a piece of paper and staring at an Arab man, dressed in white. The papers scattered on the floor in the work refer to the lists of names of those who had been inoculated. Being vaccinated against rabies required multiple jabs at increased levels of potency, and therefore names, dates and levels of vaccine were diligently recorded. The large number of sheets on the floor indicates that many people had already had their names called out and received their shots. In the centre of a canvas, a mother is holding out her wriggling child, whose bare belly indicates that it has just

¹⁷⁶ le Roux, “La vie à Paris: A travers le Salon”, *Le Temps*, Saturday 30 April, 1887.

¹⁷⁷ Roger Ballu, “Salon de 1887”, supplement to *L’illustration*, 30 April, 1887, n. 2305., n.p.

been, or is about to be, inoculated by the physician sitting next to Pasteur. Behind the Arab are Russians and Armenians, their national identities exhibited by their long beards and furry hats. *Le monde illustré* wrote that the painting shows:

M. Pasteur dans son cabinet de la rue d'Ulm, cabinet encombré de gens accourus de partout, confiants dans la méthode de l'illustre savant. A gauche, un Arabe, des Arméniens, des Russes; à droite, une foule; au centre, une jeune mère tenant dans les bras son enfant auquel l'opérateur s'apprête à inoculer le virus sauveur. Debout, au premier plan, de profil, M. Pasteur lit une lettre que lui a remis l'Arabe.¹⁷⁸

Unlike the portrait he exhibited in 1886, Gsell's 1887 painting represents Pasteur in a more humanitarian light. The artist replaced the microscopes, books and pipettes from the earlier portrait with international patients and members of the Parisian public. By excluding scientific tools from the 1887 portrait, Gsell symbolically altered Pasteur's identity as an experimental chemist and in turn constructed him as a doctor figure as Pasteur's intense gaze is focused on human beings rather than virus-filled glass tubes. Unlike the 1886 portrait, in which Gsell represented Pasteur's intellectual endeavours within the private and privileged setting of the laboratory, the setting of the 1887 portrait is shown as an accessible place in which Pasteur's science is made public.

The privacy of Pasteur's science was a point of contention between January and June 1887, when Doctor Michel Peter attacked the legitimacy and ethics of Pasteur's work on rabies at the Académie de médecine, claiming in part that Pasteur's methods were not purely scientific because he kept his methods secret.¹⁷⁹ Pasteur fought back by pointing out how he had allowed both French and international doctors and scientists into his laboratories to check his work and further stressed the internationalism of his science and its ability to save people regardless of national borders. Although the majority of the members of the Académie de médecine supported Pasteur, including major figures in the Parisian medical world, such as Doctors Vulpian and Charcot, it was important that the image of Pasteur exhibited at the 1887 Salon, during the time of Pasteur's interrogation at the Académie de médecine, show him as the man who brought health and safety not only to the French public but to the whole of humanity. Pasteur needed to be known as a man who saved people not one who experimented on them. As is evident in the cartoon of Pasteur published on the cover of *Le Grelot* on 8 November 1885, in which Henri Rochefort, Emile Zola and Granier de Casagnac are shown tied to chairs, struggling to

¹⁷⁸ Olivier Merson, "Le Salon de 1887", *Le monde illustré*, 14 May 1887, n.p.

¹⁷⁹ Adrien Marx, "M. Pasteur et le Dr Peter", *Le Figaro*, 23 January 1887, n.p.

free themselves in order to flee from Pasteur's needle, Pasteur's identity as a cruel experimental scientist competed against his persona as the saviour of humanity (Fig. 44). Yet the scandalous identities of the men depicted in the cartoon also indicate that Pasteur's science was not only believed to be able to treat physical ailments, but was also seen to cure moral and political ills. Gsell must have been familiar with the debates surrounding Pasteur's rabies vaccinations through his family connections (he was Pasteur's nephew) and by the widespread discussions in newspapers and magazines. It is possible that Gsell chose to portray Pasteur as a doctor figure, curing bodies, in order to compensate for this bad press.

Gsell's painting shows Pasteur as an integral figure in the process of vaccination even though Pasteur is not shown as the man who is physically curing patients. Pasteur could not inject patients himself because he was not a medical doctor. Although there were debates about whether or not Pasteur should have been given an honorary medical degree, he remained a chemist. An article by Mercutio in *La Revue Blanche* from April 1886 indicates that the public were well aware of Pasteur's professional status:

Vous savez que M. Pasteur n'est pas médecin, il n'a jamais étudié la médecine. Or, n'étant pas docteur il ne peut faire lui-même ses inoculations et est obligé de s'adjoindre un vrai médecin pour pratiquer ces petites opérations. Pour obvier à cet inconvénient il a, paraît-il, été question de nommer M. Pasteur docteur en médecine, d'office et sans examen. C'est là une mesure que j'avoue ne pas comprendre et dont je saisis peu l'absolue utilité. Cela n'enlèvera pas une parcelle de gloire à M. Pasteur de n'avoir pas fait lui-même les inoculations dont les agents actifs ont été préparés par sa méthode.

A l'époque où nous vivons un homme ne peut pas se froisser de ne pas être un homme universel. M. Pasteur, comme tous les savants d'aujourd'hui, est un spécialiste; laissons-le donc tel qu'il est sans chercher à le parer d'avantages qu'il n'a pas et dont il n'a point besoin. Il n'en sera pas moins grand pour cela.¹⁸⁰

As is evident in Mercutio's text, Pasteur's identity as a specialist was to be praised rather than criticized. Although he was not a medical doctor, Pasteur's role was understood as crucial to the successful progress of modern French medicine. Pasteur represented the potential that experimental laboratory science could bring to medicine. The vital role of Pasteur in medicine was discussed by J. Hirschler in his book *Nos Docteurs*, in which he wrote:

Plus que les autres, la médecine actuelle s'est lancée dans ce mouvement de découverte. Grâce à ses admirables méthodes expérimentales, grâce au génie de

¹⁸⁰ Mercutio, "Causerie", *La Revue Blanche*, 15 April 1886, n.p.

quelques hommes comme Pasteur, qui ont ouvert à ses investigations, à ses exploitations, un monde nouveau, elle s'est rajeunie, elle s'est transformée.¹⁸¹

Hirschler further discussed the dominance of science in all new medical discoveries and technologies when he asked, “Où est la médecine dans toutes ces découvertes? Nulle part! Où est la Science qui doit profiter le médecin? Partout!”¹⁸² Like the painting by Gsell, many images in the public press showed Pasteur as a scientist, holding a piece of paper in his hand, recording and watching people being inoculated. He was frequently portrayed as the brains behind the physical demands of practicing medicine – he was rarely shown touching or puncturing bodies.

Although Pasteur was not usually represented as a doctor inoculating patients, numerous scenes of rabies inoculation are similar to those depicting vaccination and Edward Jenner, the English physician who proved that cowpox provided a vaccination against smallpox during the 1790s.¹⁸³ Many pictures of Jenner, such as those painted by Ernest Board and Eugène-Ernest Hillemacher, show him vaccinating young children who were accompanied by their mothers (Fig. 45, 46). Similarly, a mother and child occupy the centre of Gsell’s 1887 canvas and also figure in other representations of Pasteur reproduced in the popular press. Yet unlike the close physical contact depicted in the paintings of Jenner, in which he is shown personally vaccinating children’s plump arms, Pasteur was represented at a distance from his patients, eyeing them up and checking their names off lists. As is evident Bayard’s painting and a nineteenth-century advertising card for *La Chocolaterie d’Aiguebelle*, Pasteur was most often shown supervising the inoculation and organization of the crowd (Fig. 47,48). Yet Pasteur’s association with Jenner situated the chemist within the medical realm as many nineteenth-century journalists made the link between the two men. *La Revue Blanche* claimed in 1886 that, “...Pasteur s’est élevé, cette année, au premier rang des bienfaiteurs de l’humanité; il est, avec Jenner, le propagateur de la vaccine, un des hommes ayant le plus mérité la reconnaissance de ses semblables.”¹⁸⁴ In his 1886 article, “Une Caricature sur la découverte de la Vaccine – Jenner- M. Pasteur,” Ernest Maindron justified Pasteur’s work on rabies by relating it to Jenner’s smallpox vaccination, claiming that, “Presque toutes

¹⁸¹ J. Hirschler, *Nos Docteurs*, (Paris, 1896), p. 12.

¹⁸² Hirschler, p. 17.

¹⁸³ Jordanova justly points out that although Jenner was well known for his work on smallpox, he was also a surgeon, country squire and natural historian, and therefore his social and professional positions were never simple. Jordanova (2000), p. 24.

¹⁸⁴ A.P., “Echos de la Science”, *La Revue Blanche*, 15 January 1886, p. 5.

les grandes découvertes ont trouvé d'obscurs détracteurs... On aurait dû comprendre que c'est à l'avenir seul qu'il appartient de juger sainement de ces choses."¹⁸⁵ Pasteur's rabies work gained legitimacy through its connection with Jenner's vaccination, which by the late nineteenth century was fully accepted and practiced by the French public and medical establishments. Furthermore, it constructed Pasteur, like Jenner, as both a scientific innovator and a man who cures.

Pasteur's association with medicine and medical men also destabilized his identity as chemist, as is evident in a late nineteenth-century advertisement for *Chocolat Carpentier*, in which he is shown as a doctor injecting patients with the rabies vaccine (Fig. 49). In this image, Pasteur is shown as the seated inoculator, focused on a patient's bare stomach, while his next patient awaits her turn, her bare shoulder symbolizing her readiness for the jab. Underneath the representation of Pasteur are the words, "*La Médecine*." By using the figure of Pasteur, who was understood as the protector of French strength and well being, the *Chocolate Carpentier* company imbued their chocolate with the health and safety associated with Pasteur. As an advertisement, the *Chocolat Carpentier* image of Pasteur was mass produced and circulated, and thus propagated not only *Carpentier* chocolate but also the image of Pasteur as a medical man who cures and protects humanity from a deadly disease. Similarly, Gsell's portrait of Pasteur, seen by over 500,000 visitors who frequented the 1887 Salon, exhibited a similar image of Pasteur as a man who saves. Despite their different mediums and cultural status, both images served to propagate the importance of Pasteur in modern medicine and the necessity of rabies vaccination for everyone.

Representing the Vaccinated Other: Pasteur's Patients

Tales of Pasteur's many patients filled the papers. *L'Evènement* described the scene at the laboratory:

Tout se passe rapidement et dans le plus grand ordre; j'ai vu défiler devant moi des enfants de tous âges, des hommes et des femmes de toutes classes et de toutes les nationalités, des soldats d'Afrique et de Tunisie, et enfin les fameux moujiks, de tous les plus dangereusement atteints...¹⁸⁶

La Nature also focused on the diversity of Pasteur's patients:

¹⁸⁵ Ernest Maindron, "Une Caricature sur la découverte de la Vaccine – Jenner – M. Pasteur", *La Nature*, 14, 2, n. 679-704, p. 160.

¹⁸⁶ "M. Pasteur et les Conseillers Municipaux", *L'Evènement*, 30 March 1886, n.p.

De tous côtés, des victimes des chiens enragés arrivaient réclamer le bénéfice du traitement de M. Pasteur. C'étaient les gens de Brie, comme les appelait familièrement le maître, des étrangers, des Allemands, des femmes, des enfants etc., tout un monde qui, chaque matin, venaient remplir le cabinet attenant au grand laboratoire."¹⁸⁷

Gsell's painting represents the spectacle of vaccination, as men and women from around the world are shown together in Pasteur's laboratory. Like Gervex's painting of Péan's surgical theatre and Brouillet's portrayal of Charcot's medical stage, Pasteur's laboratory is shown as a popular and fashionable place where the display, scrutiny and curing of bodies is paramount. The act of looking fills Gsell's canvas: Pasteur's eyes are focused on the Arab, the Arab watches the twisting child, the mother looks down on her toddler, a crowd of medical men in white coats peek around one another to get a good look at the patients and inoculation procedure, and a young woman leans out from behind Pasteur's body to stare out at the viewer. Gsell's painting stages the importance of seeing in the detection of difference, as bodies of different sexes, ages, races and cultures are all depicted within the same Parisian laboratory. The spectacle of inoculation was not only depicted within Gsell's canvas but the painting itself drew a crowd at the Salon. Alexis Martin praised Gsell's work when he wrote, "félicitons-le sincèrement d'arrêter non seulement la foule, mais encore les connoisseurs devant sa toile."¹⁸⁸ The English physician Doctor Alfred J. H Crespi also noted the entertainment value of Pasteur's procedures:

After a time, on the arrival of the physicians, I pass through the barrier and the small room into a large inner one, where I found many people, - a quiet, orderly, animated, well-dressed throng, a few patients, but the majority visitors or inquirers like myself...there was an appearance of something like a show in the proceedings and the place that would wear away should the laboratory remain open for years. Many of the aristocratic gentlemen and graceful ladies who passed through the rooms had evidently come to look around, just as they might, later in the day, go for a flower show, or a picture gallery.¹⁸⁹

As noted by Crespi, Pasteur's laboratory was as much a site of curing as it was popular entertainment.

The intense and focused scrutiny of bodies was justified as a scientific pursuit, particularly in medical examinations. Adrien Marx wrote in *Le Figaro* that, "Le meilleur

¹⁸⁷ A. Cartaz, "La Rage: Traitement prophylactique de M. Pasteur", *La Nature*, 27 February 1886, pp. 214.

¹⁸⁸ Alexis Martin, "Guide du Visiteur - la peinture et la sculpture au Salon de 1887", supplement to *La Gazette des Femmes*, 10 May 1887, p. 54.

¹⁸⁹ J. H Crespi "Pasteur at Home" *Gentleman's Magazine*, 28, 1911, March 1890, p. 266-273.

docteur...est celui dont le regard pénètre sous la mystérieuse enveloppe pour deviner les mystères qu'elle cache..."¹⁹⁰ Although looking was a requisite of the medical profession, the public viewing of bodies was fraught by the anxieties that arose from the unstable boundaries between scientific looking and public voyeurism. Pasteur's laboratory became a site in which medical and public gazes blurred. Naked stomachs were not only seen by doctors and scientists but also by the Parisian and international public who watched as they waited their turn. As is evident in a print published in *La Nature*, many people took pleasure in viewing the inoculation procedure (Fig. 50). Pasteur's laboratory was simultaneously a site of medical curing and a venue of modern spectacle, a place where bodies were undressed and punctured under watching eyes. Public opinion about rabies inoculation was discussed by Jean de Nivelles. In his 1886 article in *Le Soleil*, he pokes fun at M. Cattiaux, a critic of Pasteur who was upset that rabies inoculations required that stomachs be uncovered. Nivelles's article quotes Cattiaux's critique in *Bulletin municipal officiel*:

M. Pasteur pratique ses inoculations au ventre. Pourquoi là plutôt qu'ailleurs? Pourquoi pas au bras? M. Pasteur reçoit dans son laboratoire, des femmes et des jeunes filles, et je n'hésite pas à qualifier d'inconvenante cette inoculation au ventre.¹⁹¹

In response to Cattiaux, Nivelles sarcastically wrote, "Hélas! Pourquoi s'être arrêté en chemin? Pourquoi n'avoir pas déclaré tout nettement qu'il s'agissait de la fondation d'un Institut pornographique?"¹⁹² As is evident in Nivelles's article, the display of naked bodies and body parts in clinics, laboratories and hospitals was subject to public criticism despite the general belief that the medical and scientific gaze was rational and objective rather than libidinous and desiring.

Unlike the print in *La Nature*, in which a young woman is represented with her stomach exposed, Gsell did not include women's bare bellies in his work. This omission helped construct Pasteur's laboratory as a space of rational curing rather than spectacular voyeurism. In contrast to Gervex and Brouillet's paintings, in which unconscious semi-naked female bodies occupy central positions, the women in Gsell's canvas are fully dressed, conscious and engaged. The woman in the centre is represented as a proper bourgeois mother, holding out her child to display to the Arab traveller the curative

¹⁹⁰ Marx, n.p.

¹⁹¹ Jean de Nivelles, "Haute-Comique", *Le Soleil*, 31 March 1886, n.p.

¹⁹² de Nivelles, n.p.

power of French science. The child symbolizes the health and prosperity of France, as well as the modernity and progress of French science, thus serving as a model that the rest of the world was to emulate. The health of young children was believed to ensure the well being of nations. The vaccination of children was significant because it exemplified the potential of preventative healthcare. Through the discoveries of modern scientific medicine, children did not have to suffer from the maladies that plagued previous generations. Furthermore, Gsell's painting exhibited the new demands of bourgeois motherhood. Women were encouraged to protect and maintain the health of their children with the help of French science as modern maternity required the integration of scientific medicine into the family home.

The bond between science and family was symbolically on display in Pasteur's laboratory. Two stained-glass panels hung side by side in the windows of Pasteur's laboratory, directly above the spot where people were inoculated (Fig. 51). One pane represents a female figure symbolizing Chemistry. She is shown kneeling before a pestle and mortar, one hand resting on a book while her other lifts a flask so that she can peer directly at its contents (Fig. 52). The glass jar being heated on the burner to her right and the apparently empty flasks refer to Pasteur's work on germ theory and bacteria, as Pasteur argued that despite being invisible to the human eye, bacteria were always present and could be killed off through heating. The second stained glass portrays Pasteur's daughter, Marie-Louise, as a young schoolgirl (Fig. 53). Dressed in the uniform of the boarders of the *Couvent des Oiseaux*, Pasteur's daughter is presented as a serious student, and her intellectual endeavours are emphasized by the book she holds. Placed side by side, the stained-glass windows not only represent chemistry as a female body but also as a female pursuit. Significantly, Pasteur commissioned Gsell's father, Jean-Gaspard Jules Gsell, to make him these panes. By exhibiting these glass works in the public side of his laboratory, Pasteur was not only able to display the two most important things in his life, science and family, but was able to visually unite the two, thus reinforcing the crucial role of science in the protection of families. As is evident in the nineteenth-century drawing by Bayard, these images held a prominent place in Pasteur's laboratory (Fig. 54). Situated directly across from the laboratory door and lit by the sunlight that fell through the windows, these images were seen by all who entered. Under the watchful eye of Chemistry and Pasteur's daughter, the Parisian and international public were inoculated.

La vaccine de la rage shows rabies vaccination as a trustworthy procedure as doctors are shown preparing to inject French children and adults. Yet the representation of European patients and doctors next to a North African man also displays the role of French medical procedures in colonial expansion. Rabies inoculation was regarded by Europeans as progressive and civilized, particularly when compared to non-western medicine that was considered tribal, rural, archaic and non-scientific. In order to construct the superiority and modernity of French medicine, Gsell included an Arab man to symbolize the supposedly backwards, 'primitive' and child-like ways of non-French people. The Arab in *La vaccine de la rage* is shown as the recipient of French knowledge as French colonization is seen to be curative and generous. Although Arabs were deemed worthy of being saved from diseases, they were nonetheless understood (popularly and medically) as inferior, sick and in need of French intervention. Behind the rational and humanitarian guise of scientific medicine created by Gsell, the French desire to control and dominate their colonized remains.

On 29 May, 1886, *La Nature* published the article "M. Pasteur et le traitement de la Rage" by Gaston Tissandier, accompanied by a photograph of Arabs standing in the Jardin Luxembourg (Fig. 55). In the print, eight Arab men and women are shown in their cultural dress, surrounded by a large group of French on-lookers. As described in *La Nature*, the photograph was taken by an amateur photographer with his *appareil instantané* who happened to come across this crowd in the park:

Son attention fut attirée par un rassemblement de promeneurs qui entouraient un groupe d'Arabes. C'étaient 'les Arabes de Pasteur', suivant l'expression des assistants, ou plutôt les Arabes mordus par les chiens enragés et traités par M. Pasteur. Voici l'appareil braqué sur les Arabes, qui consentent à obéir au 'ne bougeons plus', et voilà le positif obtenu reproduit dans *La Nature*.¹⁹³

As is evident in the photograph, the spectacle of the Arabs was produced by their difference from the French.¹⁹⁴ Dressed head to toe in white, their heads covered with layers of cloth, the Arab bodies stand in contrast to the varied, but uniformly dark, costumes of the French. Told to 'sit still', the Arabs' presence in Paris was documented by a passer-by, who with the use of a newly available instant camera was able to capture and create a historic moment. Crespi's description of Pasteur's laboratory also shows how non-European bodies contributed to the spectacle of vaccination. He wrote:

¹⁹³ Gaston Tissandier, "M. Pasteur et le traitement de la rage", *La Nature*, 29 May 1886, p. 410.

¹⁹⁴ See Gen Doy for a discussion of French photographs North Africans, particularly Arab women. Gen Doy, *Women and Visual Culture in Nineteenth-Century France, 1800-1852* (New York, 1998), pp. 220-248.

On my second morning in the rooms, matters went on much the same. I noticed a dark man of fifty, whom I cross-examined. He was a physician from Cairo, sent to Paris to investigate the matter...Among the patients were two foreign women – one tall, the other short, both singularly handsome. ‘What are these people?’, I inquired. ‘One,’ he replied, ‘is an Arab; the other, I don’t know.’ The short woman whom he had called an Arab heard him, and politely begged his pardon, disclaiming any Arab blood.¹⁹⁵

As Crespi’s commentary attests, Arab bodies, be they physicians or patients, were a source of entertainment and speculation, their presence as spectacular as Pasteur’s scientific feats.

Gsell’s Salon painting, like the amateur’s photograph, was understood as a realistic representation of Pasteur’s Arab patients. In both works, the patients’ cultural identities were prominently identified by their difference from the French. Despite the diversity of the crowd in the painting, Gsell compositionally grouped the figures by nationality. The Russians and Armenians talk behind the lone Arab while the large group of French men and women form a cluster that dominates the canvas. Unlike the Arab, Russian and Armenian men, the French men are not depicted as patients but as professionals who cure. Their professional status and collective identity are symbolized by their matching suits, short hair and trimmed beards. Like the male audience painted by Brouillet, the faces and bodies of the French men shown in Gsell’s canvas blur into one another, forming a block of uniformity in which only subtle facial characteristics differentiate one man from the other. In contrast, the Arab man stands alone. The folded white drapery of his attire and his slip-on shoes contrast with the contemporary Parisian dress of Pasteur and the group of figures depicted on the right: the men are shown in dark suits while the women wear fashionable Parisian dresses and fancy hats. The Arab’s simple sheet-like garb contrasts with the tailored clothes of the French. The modernity of France is produced by intricate store-bought clothing - even the young child is adorned with high socks, layered undergarments, leather shoes and a jacket with cuffs. In contrast to the modernity of the French, the Arab is constructed as ‘primitive’, as is symbolized by his gnarled wooden stick that contrasts with the thin and delicate cane held by the *parisienne*. Unlike the Arab’s stick, which is used to hold up the man’s hunched body, the woman uses hers as a fashion accessory, resting on her shoulder.

Although the Russians and Armenians are grouped on the ‘foreign’ side, their interactions and clothing are more similar to the French than the Arab. Pasteur had a

¹⁹⁵ Crespi, pp. 266-273.

great respect for the Russians: he invited Russian scientists to work at his institute, seven rabies inoculation centres based on Pasteur's discoveries were established in Russia, and Pasteur encouraged a Franco-Russian alliance as a means to strengthen France's position against Prussia.¹⁹⁶ Russians were also part of several scientific societies in Paris, particularly the medical community, as many Russian men and women came to Paris to study medicine. In *La vaccine de la rage au laboratoire de M. Pasteur*, Gsell depicted a group of Russian peasants, known as moujiks.¹⁹⁷ Their identity as Russian peasants is indicated by their furry hats and long beards as well as their visible likeness to representations of Pasteur's Russian patients that were in newspapers and Pasteur's published photographs (Fig. 56). The most recognizable of Pasteur's Russian patients were a group from Smolensk. Gaston Tissandier described their visit to Pasteur in his article about the Arabs in *La Nature*:

A l'heure actuelle, M. Pasteur a traité environ 1100 personnes mordues par les chiens enragés; toutes sont guéries et sauvées.

Il faut mentionner a part les dix-neuf Russes qui ont été mordus par un loup enragé. Il existe de profondes différences entre les suites de morsures par les loups ou par les chiens enragés. Le loup, en s'acharnant sur ses victimes, introduit en plus grande quantité le virus rabique. Si l'on retarde de quelques jours le traitement préventif, on risque d'arriver quand l'économie tout entière est déjà envahie par le mal. Nous reproduisons, page 401, la photographie de l'un de ces Russes pour montrer quelle énorme déchirure la morsure du loup enragé avait pratiquée. Au autre Russe avait eu les lèvres arrachées; un autre avait été mordu au front avec tant de fureur qu'une des dents de la bête était restée incrustée dans le crâne; tous avaient été soumis à des blessures graves, trois d'entre eux sont morts.

Mais si l'on appliquait aux dix-neuf russes de Smolensk les statistiques de mortalité établies à la suite des morsures par les loups enragés, la proportion serait renversée; sur les dix-neuf, seize auraient succombés.¹⁹⁸

The Russians were widely known as the most severely bitten and infected of all of Pasteur's patients, and therefore saving the Russians from wolf bites was a great feat for Pasteur as it helped prove and exhibit the potency of his rabies vaccine. Pasteur was proud of this scientific achievement as is evident by the photograph he gave and dedicated to his granddaughter, Camille, which shows the group of Russians on their trip

¹⁹⁶ Doctors Metchnikoff and Gamaleïa were two Russians who worked at the Pasteur Institute. The importance of Russia and Russians to Pasteur and the Institute were discussed in the speeches given at the inauguration of the Pasteur Institute in 1888. See *Inauguration de l'Institut Pasteur* (Paris, 1888).

¹⁹⁷ For a discussion of moujiks, see A.E Cazalet, "The Moujik", *The Economic Journal*, 11, 44, December 1901, pp. 575-581.

¹⁹⁸ Tissandier (1886), p. 402.

to Paris (Fig. 57). Russians were included in many representations of Pasteur with patients, such as in the engraving published in the English publication *The Graphic* in 1886, in which Pasteur is shown surrounded by children and Russians (Fig. 58). By including the group of Russians in his painting, Gsell was able to exhibit not only the prominent role of Russian scientists in Pasteur's laboratory and the acceptance of Pasteurian principles in Russian hospitals, but more importantly, to display one of Pasteur's greatest triumphs in his work on rabies.

Gsell's painting exhibited the international significance of Pasteur and his science through the representation of people from all over the globe. Despite the cultural differences highlighted in *La vaccine de la rage*, the painting shows the indiscriminate nature of rabies vaccination as it could be applied to all people. Gsell portrayed Pasteur as a man who not only protected and insured the health of France but of all of humanity. By showing Pasteur's science as tolerant and universally accessible, Gsell's Pasteur fit comfortably within textual accounts that stressed Pasteur's humanitarianism. Raymond Poincaré, who would later become president of France, eulogized Pasteur using the same terms. He wrote:

France, which you loved so much, will proudly preserve our venerated memory as a national good, as a consolation, as a hope. Humanity, which you have helped, will surround your glory in a unanimous and imperishable cult wherever national rivalries dissolve, and wherever the common faith in unlimited progress is kept alive and strong.¹⁹⁹

Science simultaneously served to unify and divide nations. Scientific discourse brought people together as it showed that scientific medicine could cure humans regardless of sex, class, race or gender yet it also provided 'scientific proof' that difference existed among these distinctions and that not all races, sexes, religions, cultures and nationalities were equal. The close contact of people from many countries and continents in Pasteur's laboratory lead to national comparisons and exposed prejudices, as Crespi's quoting from an article in *Fortnightly Review* attests: "French and Belgian peasants are clean and neat, but lower order Spanish, Portuguese and Russians are dirty and loathsome to a degree."²⁰⁰ Science was understood as democratic and objective despite its political and economic motivations. Great scientific battles between European countries took place in non-Western territories because these nations offered western scientists ample specimens and

¹⁹⁹ Louis Lumet, *Pasteur, sa vie, son oeuvre: Ouvrage orné de 121 gravure* (Paris, 1923), pp. 168-170 as translated in Geison, p. 259.

²⁰⁰ Crespi, p. 271.

unstudied diseases. Science could ‘progress’ more quickly in places where human experimentation was permitted. Although French doctors and scientists wrote about wanting to improve the lives of non-western people, spreading French science was also crucial for France as a world power. The French military needed to be protected from diseases, such as malaria, that weakened armies.²⁰¹ As is evident in a late nineteenth-century British print, where soldiers are shown being vaccinated before heading into a colonial battle, scientific medicine was believed to strengthen and protect a country’s military (Fig. 59). The expansion of western scientific medicine in non-western nations also functioned as a tool of colonization.²⁰² Western scientific medicine improved the hygiene and health of the people in some of its colonies yet it also ‘scientifically’ justified the taking over of lands and people. By constructing colonized people as barbaric and sick, French medical intervention was believed to humanize and civilize non-western people; like rabid dogs, it was thought that they needed to be made safe, healthy and docile.²⁰³ Yet colonized subjects were also presented as innocent and naïve, and therefore were seen to demand medical intervention, as were French children. In Gsell’s work, the Arab man and young child are linked pictorially as both are shown as the main recipients of inoculation.

Pasteur was regularly represented with children, as is evident in both Gsell and Bonnat’s Salon paintings. In Gsell’s canvas, the young child occupies a central position and serves as the main example of inoculation. Pasteur’s role as a family man was often discussed in newspapers, magazines and books, and was shown in published photographs of the chemist with his grandchildren, children, and wife. In a four page article written by Gsell’s brother Paul in *Revue Encyclopédique*, the author provided a full written account of Pasteur’s family, writing that, “Pour ses enfants le grand homme a toujours été un excellent père: ses amis se souviennent de l’avoir vu faisant danser un bébé sur ses genoux pendant que sa femme en déshabillait un autre pour le mettre au lit.”²⁰⁴ The

²⁰¹ For a discussion of malaria and the expansion of French colonies, see William B. Cohen, “Malaria and French Imperialism”, *The Journal of African History*, 24, 1, 1983, pp. 23-36. For an account of the impact of diseases on European colonization see Philip D. Curtin, *The Disease and Empire: The Health of European Troops in the Conquest of Africa* (Cambridge, 1998) and his *Death by Migration: Europe’s Encounter with the Tropical World* (Cambridge, 1989).

²⁰² John Farley argues that the study of tropical medicine was fundamentally imperialist. For his examination of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century tropical medicine, see *Bilharzia: A History of Imperial Tropical Medicine* (Cambridge, 1991).

²⁰³ See James R. Lehning for examination of how French colonial subjects were turned into ‘good’ republicans. Lehning, *To be a Citizen: The Political Culture of the Early French Third Republic* (Ithaca, 2001).

²⁰⁴ Gsell, p. 20.

article was illustrated with photographs and drawings of Pasteur, his wife and their children, as well as two pictures of Pasteur's childhood homes. Pasteur's connection to children was further emphasized by the fact that his first public patients were boys.

On 6 July 1885, Pasteur treated Joseph Meiser, a nine-year-old Alsatian child who had been severely bitten by a rabid dog. Meiser was given a cumulative treatment of twelve injections of the rabies vaccine progressing from the least to the most virulent. Before beginning the process, Pasteur discussed the case with Doctor Vulpian, who was a colleague at the *Académie des sciences* and a member of the French rabies commission, and Doctor Grancher, who was the clinical professor of children's diseases at the Paris *Faculté de médecine*. It was decided that Pasteur should attempt to vaccinate Meiser because the child had nothing to lose. A few months after Meiser's successful treatment, Pasteur was called upon by the mayor of Vilers-Farlay to try his vaccine on a fifteen-year-old boy, Jean-Baptiste Jupille, who had been bitten by a rabid dog while in the process of saving other children. As is evident in the speech Pasteur gave to the *Académie des sciences* on 26 October 1886, in which he announced the great successes of his rabies treatment on humans, Jupille's story helped gain public support for Pasteur's rabies vaccination because of its heroic and dramatic character. Pasteur's emotional involvement in the story is evident in this speech:

L'Académie n'entendra peut-être pas sans émotion le récit de l'acte de courage et de présence d'esprit de l'enfant dont j'ai entrepris le traitement mardi dernier. C'est un berger, âgé de quinze ans, du nom de Jean-Baptiste Jupille, de Villers-Farlay (Jura), qui, voyant un chien à allure suspecte, de forte taille, se précipiter sur un groupe de six de ses petits camarades, tous plus jeunes que lui, s'est élancé, armé de son fouet, au-devant de l'animal. Le chien saisit Jupille à la main gauche. Jupille alors terrasse le chien, le maintient sous lui, lui ouvre la gueule avec sa main droite pour dégager sa main gauche, non sans recevoir plusieurs morsures nouvelles, puis, avec la lumière de son fouet, il lui lie le museau, et, saisissant l'un de ses sabots, il l'assomme.

Je m'empresserai de faire connaître à l'Académie ce qui adviendra de cette nouvelle tentative.²⁰⁵

Representations of Jupille served multiple purposes for Pasteur. Jupille was considered an ideal patient: an innocent and selfless boy whom science could save. Furthermore, Jupille and Pasteur came from the same part of France. Pasteur had experienced the effects of rabies at close range during his childhood, when a rabid dog attacked villagers

²⁰⁵ Louis Pasteur, "Communications faites à l'Académie de Sciences", 19 May 1884, in *Le Traitement de la rage* (Paris, 1886), pp. 26-27.

from a nearby town. Although Pasteur's first patient, the Alsatian boy, Meiser, symbolized the nationalism of science, as he came to embody and justify France's right to Alsace after the Franco-Prussian war, it was Jupille's story that most easily visually represented the violence and threat of rabies and the human battle against it.

Pasteur chose the image of Jupille to provide the public face of the Pasteur Institute (Fig. 60). The chemist commissioned the sculptor, Truffot, to make a sculpture of Jupille for the front yard of the Pasteur Institute. The public first became familiar with this sculpture when it was displayed at the 1887 Salon. The sculpture represents Jupille fighting a rabid dog. The young boy is shown staring directly at the dog, whose crazed eyes look up at Jupille and whose teeth are bared in a nasty growl. The sculpture depicts the moment in which Jupille has overpowered the dog, as he is portrayed with a solid grip on the dog's fleshy neck and a rope is tied around the rabid animal's snout. As is evident in the multiple images of the Pasteur Institute that filled newspapers during the year of the Institute's opening in 1888, Truffot's sculpture of Jupille was the only artwork on the grounds and thus set the tone of the institute and its purpose. As Gaston Tissandier wrote about the sculpture in *La Nature*:

Ce groupe qui rappelle un trait d'héroïsme est placé en face de l'escalier d'honneur de l'entrée principale. Il prépare en quelque sorte le visiteur aux sentiments que ne manquaient pas de lui inspirer une visite à l'Institut Pasteur. Cet établissement, unique dans le monde, n'est pas seulement, en effet, un temple de la science, c'est aussi le sanctuaire de la charité et du dévouement. Et l'on ne sait ce que l'on doit le plus admirer chez celui qui en a été le fondateur, ou du découvreur de nouvelles et fécondes doctrines, ou du bienfaiteur de l'humanité.²⁰⁶

Tissandier, Gaston's article was published alongside four images of the institute: two were plans of the buildings and their rooms, one was an outside shot of the building and the other was a representation of Truffot's sculpture (Fig. 61, 61, 63). The sculpture is also present in most nineteenth-century images of the Institute (Fig. 64, 65). The inclusion of this sculpture is particularly significant as the Pasteur Institute was described as a building that was devoid of ornament and thus regarded as the ideal model of a building dedicated to science. As written in *L'Univers illustré*, "Aucune ornementation riche n'apparaît, aucune décoration superflue: on a, dès le premier abord, l'impression de se trouver dans une maison uniquement consacrée à la science, à la recherche du soulagement des maux

²⁰⁶ Gaston Tissandier, "L'Institut Pasteur", *La Nature*, 24 November 1888, p. 406.

de l'humanité."²⁰⁷ The sculpture of Jupille was understood as an integral part of the institute rather than a mere decoration.

Although Truffot's sculpture represents the story of one of Pasteur's first patients, it symbolically exemplifies the values with which Pasteur and the Institute wished to be associated. Pasteur was often regarded as a saintly figure. In images in the public press he was shown as Christ-like, surrounded by Christian symbols of innocence: hallows, flowing white robes and lambs (Fig. 66, 67). The sculpture's representation of Jupille's physical strength and literal fight against rabies stood in for Pasteur's intellectual and scientific struggle against the disease. It also symbolized the battles being fought by laboratory science against Nature, which was understood as wild and uncontrollable, and was embodied in Truffot's work by the snarling mad dog. Jupille's selfless act of fighting a dog in order to save young children also emphasized the role of Pasteur and science in the protection of children. Furthermore, the sculpture showed that rabies was dangerously real, had a source and needed to be destroyed. This was particularly important as some of Pasteur's critics argued that it was hard to prove who had actually acquired rabies when the rabid animal could not be found; it was suggested that Pasteur gave his patient rabies rather than cured them.

Kathleen Kete claims that the nineteenth-century fear of rabies often manifested itself in the acting out of rabies symptoms - even Pasteur was fooled by a case of hysterical rabies.²⁰⁸ Kete argues that:

In the phobic imagination of the nineteenth century, the semiotics of rabies centred on violence and sexuality, and its etiology on repression...The fear of rabies lies at the intersection of the organizing themes of bourgeois life and can be read as an expression of uneasiness about modern civilization and its tolls, about the uncertain conquest of culture over nature.²⁰⁹

Although there was considerable public fear surrounding rabies because it was understood to reduce human beings into animals, there was simultaneously the belief that civilized life could alter one's natural disposition, thus causing illness. People feared that rabies itself was a product of modernity. The increased popularity for keeping dogs as domestic pets was believed to spontaneously cause rabies in dogs because kept dogs were not allowed to fulfil their natural mating urges while contained in cramped city apartments. As Kete points out, rabies was intricately linked to sex, as unhealthy and

²⁰⁷ "Inauguration de l'Institut Pasteur", *L'Univers illustré*, 24 November 1888, p. 742.

²⁰⁸ Kete, pp. 89-90.

²⁰⁹ Kete, p. 90.

unnatural sexual behaviours were believed to be bound to the emergence of spontaneous rabies in dogs.²¹⁰ As rabies threatened to upset the controlled and rational lives of middle and upper-class Parisians, it also promised the spectacle of the bourgeoisie gone mad. Like the images of hysterics at the Salpêtrière that filled the papers, photographs of rabies patients published in the public press showed bodies out of control, tongues exposed, eyes half shut and muscles contracted. The bodies of rabies victims, like those of hysterics, were defined as sick by their difference to the controlled and clothed bodies of the bourgeoisie who followed the rules of proper social comportment.

Gsell's painting does not depict people suffering from rabies, nor does it represent the sexualized spectacle of uncontrolled bodies on display. Nonetheless, it does draw upon the spectacle of Pasteur's patients as did Truffot's sculpture. Jupille was not the only one to acquire celebrity status. Papers reported on many of Pasteur's patients, with particular emphasis on those who travelled from abroad to be cured in Paris. The tales of the Newark Boys, six American boys from New Jersey who were bitten by a rabid dog and sent to Paris to be cured, filled the American and Parisian press (Fig. 68). As Bert Hansen argues, the sustained American interest in this story during the nineteenth century changed popular expectations of medicine.²¹¹ Not only did it show that medical news was thrilling to ordinary people, but it took scientific knowledge and medical innovations beyond the elitist spheres of medical schools, laboratories and specialist journals and made it accessible to the general public. The celebrity of Pasteur's patients was encouraged and sustained by their mass visibility. Illustrated and photographed in daily newspapers, the bodies of Pasteur's patients became a source of entertainment. As exemplified by the Newark Boys, who were actually on display to the American public at the famous entertainment venue and wax museum, the Eden Musée in New York, the spectacle of these inoculated bodies was able to draw a crowd.

The internationalism of Pasteur's science, as exemplified by the varied and various people who came to Paris to be inoculated by his methods, served not only to spread the fame of Pasteur and France internationally, but helped raise funds for the Pasteur Institute. Although the Pasteur Institute received some money from the French government, it was primarily funded by private donations and by the money Pasteur's laboratory received from patented discoveries. Monetary contributions to the Pasteur Institute were a form of public entertainment as newspapers listed all those who had

²¹⁰ Kete, p. 94.

²¹¹ Hansen, p. 374.

donated, from the poorest of Parisians to the wealthiest international royals. The public support of the Institute was also given ample attention at the opening of the Institute on 15 November 1888. As described by Doctor J Janicot in *Le Figaro*:

...M. Christophle, gouverneur du Crédit foncier, a fait le rapport financier sur l'Institut Pasteur. Je ne me serais jamais douté qu'on pût enrober des chiffres d'aussi agréable façon....Le don des riches, l'obole des pauvres – obole singulièrement touchante parfois – a versé dans les caisses de l'Institut Pasteur *deux millions et demi* (exactement 2,586,680 francs)...Ce n'est pas assez; mais le public n'a pas dit encore son dernier mot.²¹²

The public sponsorship of the Institute was prominently exhibited above the grand entrance to the building where the words “*Institut Pasteur – Souscription publique, 1888*” were notably displayed.

International contributions were crucial to the funding of the Pasteur Institute. Pasteur actively sought out financial support from all corners of the world, acquiring major donations from Alexander III, Tzar of Russia, and Pedro II, emperor of Brazil. Pasteur publicly displayed his thanks to those who gave by personally commissioning busts of the largest benefactors: Alexander III, Madame Boucicaut, Pedro II, Madame Lebaudy, the Count de Laubespain, Baron de Rothschild and Madame Furtado-Heine (Fig. 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74). These major donors were heads of state, wealthy wives of industrial leaders and upper-class Frenchmen. The number of busts of French women shows the active role that they were beginning to have in supporting scientific medicine. Madame Boucicaut, the widow of the founder of the supermarket chain *Bon Marché*, not only gave 250 000 francs to the Pasteur Institute but also founded a new hospital in Paris that adhered to Pasteurian concepts; patients were no longer separated by sex but were divided based on their need for medical or surgical attention, and those without infectious diseases were separated from those who were contagious. As is evident in Pasteur's personal correspondence, particularly in a letter written to Doctor Grancher on 18 October 1887, he was actively involved in the creation of these portrait busts.²¹³ Exhibited in the *Salle des bustes*, the location of the inauguration of the Pasteur Institute, these busts provided the donors with cultural and historical status, as their charitable acts

²¹² Doctor J. Janicot, “Inauguration de l'Institut Pasteur”, *Le Figaro*, 15 November 1888, n.p.

²¹³ Pasteur wrote to Grancher: “S.M Don Pedro m'a dit hier qu'il allait m'écrire pour me donner rendez-vous au rue Vauquelin. Ne pensez-vous pas qu'il aurait lieu de lui conter cette affaire des bustes, lui demander le sien, demander ultérieurement celui du Sultan? Leur royauté peut bien compter pour une somme d'argent et nous aurions mieux le caractère international.” Letter from *Correspondance de Pasteur*, 18 October 1887, pp. 221-222.

were exhibited and commemorated.²¹⁴ The visibility of those who donated helped portray the Pasteur Institute as an international organization where science and industry met for the greater good of humanity.

By being exhibited a year before the inauguration of the Pasteur Institute, Gsell's painting showed Pasteur as an active and healthy figure, despite the physical ailments that were plaguing the chemist. This representation certainly encouraged further contributions to the Institute as the public were presented with an image of Pasteur as a strong and healthy leader. By being described by critics as realistic, the painting was understood as an accurate portrayal of the scientist, and therefore its political and economic aims appear to have gone unnoticed. Although Gsell could not show Pasteur in his institute, as it was still under construction, the image nonetheless represents laboratory science as Pasteur wished it to be understood. Pasteur wrote:

Je vous en conjure à ces demeures sacrées que l'on désigne du nom expressif de *laboratoire*. Demandez qu'on les mutiple et qu'on les ornes: ce sont les temples de l'avenir, de la richesses et du bien-être. C'est là que l'humanité grandit, se fortifie et devient meilleure. Elle y apprend à lire dans les oeuvres de nature, oeuvres de progrès et l'harmonie universelle tandis que ses oeuvres à elle sont trop souvent celles de la barbarie, du fanatisme et de la destruction.²¹⁵

The laboratory, like the Institute, served as a representation of Pasteur. Science, laboratories, the Institute and Pasteur became symbolically intertwined, as each one signified and represented the other. Gsell's portrait, therefore, stood in for what the Pasteur Institute was soon to symbolize. As Doctor Janicot wrote in 1888 on the occasion of the inauguration, this "établissement rappellera une conquête scientifique et humanitaire qui aura plus fait pour l'honneur de notre pays qu'une grande victoire sanglante."²¹⁶ Gsell's work represents science, personified by Pasteur and symbolized by the laboratory, as borderless and bloodless, generous and compassionate. By using techniques and a setting associated with realism, and by depicting a well-known scene of the scientist with his patients, Gsell presented his painting as a truthful historical document, thus painting Pasteur into history as a scientific leader, humanitarian and saviour of France's future, wealth and well-being.

²¹⁴ For a nineteenth-century discussion of these busts and their place at the inauguration, see Janicot.

²¹⁵ Louis Pasteur, *Quelques réflexions sur la science en France* (Paris, 1871), p. 6.

²¹⁶ Janicot, n.p.

Conclusion: A Final Portrait

Pasteur died on 28 September 1895. Newspapers published articles describing his life and scientific discoveries, printed the letters written by foreign leaders, scientists and other celebrities expressing their condolences, and reproduced a wealth of Pasteurian iconography. A State funeral was planned. Pasteur's body was brought through the streets of Paris from the Pasteur Institute to Notre Dame, accompanied by 1400 *gardiens de la paix*, 600 members of the infantry of the Republican guard and 200 cavalry men.²¹⁷ The grandeur and mass appeal of the funeral is evident in a photograph of the procession, in which the Parisian public line the streets in order to watch the funeral carriage, adorned with flags, make its way towards the grand cathedral (Fig. 75). Although the French government offered to bury Pasteur at the Pantheon, his family wanted him to be buried at the Pasteur Institute, and therefore built a private funeral chapel on the ground floor to house his body. Pasteur's son, Jean-Baptiste, overlooked the construction of the chapel, hiring well-known artists and architects to build the space.²¹⁸

Based on the late Roman Mausoleum of Galla Placidia in Ravenna, Italy, Pasteur's chapel is an example of nineteenth-century symbolist architecture and design. The brightly coloured mosaic tiles and highly stylized decorative murals in the chapel appear as the antitheses of the realistic portraits commissioned by and for the scientist during his lifetime (Fig. 76). Gsell, Bonnat and Edelfelt constructed Pasteur as a valiant modern man through heroic narratives, realistic portrayals, and the exhibition of their paintings at the Salon. Realism, as the naturalizing agent *par excellence* during the nineteenth century, was seemingly able to depoliticize and neutralize contemporary events and people through its verisimilitude to the natural world. As a style that was understood to symbolize truth and objectivity, it was considered ideal for representations of scientific culture and historical documentation. Despite the stylistic differences between the Salon portraits and the mosaic murals, the rhetoric and symbolism of Pasteur remains similar, as images of laboratory instruments, dogs, rabbits and Jupille decorate the vaulted ceiling, along with the words "Charité", "Science", "Foi" and "Espérance" (Fig. 77, 78).

²¹⁷ There are numerous accounts of Pasteur's funeral in most nineteenth-century newspapers between 29 September and 7 October. For a detailed article, see "Les Obsèques de Pasteur" in *République Française*, 6 October, 1895. For a discussion of the state funerals of men of science and medicine, see Sinding.

²¹⁸ The architect, Charles-Louis Girault, winner of the Grand Prix de Rome, designed the chapel, Auguste Guilbert-Martin did the mosaics and Luc-Olivier Merson painted the chapel. For a discussion of the chapel, see Albert Delaunay and Hilda Benichou, *Pasteur Institute* (Paris, 1984), pp. 21-24.

Within Pasteur's highly ornate and symbolist tomb exists the final realistic portrait executed in his presence: his death mask (Fig. 79).²¹⁹ This effigy is intimately connected to the chemist's physical body: it constantly evokes Pasteur's corporal presence not only by the imprint left from his minute skin creases, the fleshiness of his earlobes and the prominent curve of his nose but also by the tiny eyelashes and whiskers that emerge from the plaster surface. The cast provides a claim to truth that is not available to painted portraiture as the death mask is an indexical mould that supplies evidence of Pasteur's body. Yet the mask is unable to give a record of the chemist's achievements, politics, relationships and desires.²²⁰ Pasteur's funerary chapel, death mask and the numerous portraits show the impossibility of distinct boundaries between the real and the ideal Pasteur, the symbolic and the actual, as much as they reveal the inability of any one style or medium to claim a monopoly over truth. Pasteur's identity was produced by multiple representations of both himself and others. Salon paintings, crude cartoons, photographic portraits, stained-glass windows, amateur photographs, newspaper illustrations, mosaic tiles and portrait busts all contributed to his reputation as a modern chemist, humanitarian, father, experimental scientist, doctor and blind old man. The multiple realistic portrayals of Pasteur at the 1886 and 1887 Salons helped construct his history and his identity, yet as this chapter has shown, historical identities, like the characteristics given to styles and mediums, are slippery and unstable as they put pressure on the true and the untrue, reality and fantasy, the factual and the fictive.

²¹⁹ For information regarding death masks in nineteenth-century France, see Emmanuelle Hérin, "Le dernier portrait ou la belle mort" in *Le Dernier Portrait*, pp. 25-101, and Édouard Papet "À fleur de peau: Le moulage sur nature au XIXe siècle" in Édouard Papet, Stephen Feeke, et al., *À fleur de peau: Le moulage sur nature au XIXe siècle*, Musée d'Orsay (Paris, 2001), pp. 17-25.

²²⁰ For an account of how death masks served nationalist purposes see Marc Gotlieb's discussion of Henri Regnault's death mask in "Legends of the Painter Hero: Remembering Henri Regnault" in *Nationalism and French Visual Culture*, pp. 101-128.

The Sleep of Reason:

Doctor Péan's Collection of Bodies in Wax and in Paint

In Henri Blaze de Bury's story *Les Bonhomme de Cire* of 1863, the narrator discusses the feeling of being in a room surrounded by wax figures:

Vous connaissez l'étrange et mystérieuse impression qui vous saisit, en compagnie de ces bizarre figures, d'une réalité si vivante et auxquelles un certain sentiment d'effroi vous empêche d'adresser la parole, car vous n'êtes pas bien sûr que ces lèvres ne vous répondraient pas... On recule et on se rapproche; c'est comme une curiosité malsaine, hystérique, une sorte d'attrait répulsif.²²¹

In this text, it is the realism of the wax bodies that lures the viewer into the realm of the mysterious, the unknown and the inexplicable. The life-like quality of the wax appear to have erased the medium itself to produce what looked to be a 'real' body. Confronted with such mimetic representations, the viewer seems to lose all sense of reason. He is afraid to speak, in fear that the wax lips may spread open and reply. Regardless of his attempt to remain rational, his curiosity takes over: his eyes move over the smooth surface of the wax, absorbing the intricacies and details of the body. Seconds later he pulls back and recoils in fear and disgust, only to be drawn back again toward this human-like body that gives itself up to visual consumption. Here, the spectacle of realism produces insanity, compulsion and hysteria. This differs from the 1886 and 1887 Salon portraits of Pasteur, where formal strategies, such as smoothly applied paint and the rendering of detailed scenes, produced a realism that was understood as rational and documentary.

Unlike the majority of late nineteenth-century discourses on realism, which connected realism with truth, logic, neutrality and reason, de Bury's text exposes realism's other side: the unknown, the irrational and the veiled. This chapter will explore how the façade of realism reveals as much by what it conceals as by that which it puts on display. The often contradictory characteristics assigned to realism will not be merely considered evidence of realism's obvious inability to recreate reality perfectly but will be understood as an essential part of its drive to do so. By concentrating on Henri Gervex's oil painting *Avant l'opération*, I will explore how the main protagonist of this work, Doctor Jules Emile Péan, was both a collector and creator of different forms of realism,

²²¹ Henri Blaze de Bury, *Les Bonhommes de Cire* (Paris, 1864), p. 38.

waxworks included, and will argue that the oddities of his commissions reveal a fascination and desire that belie the rational veneer of the realist project (Fig. 6). By exploring the moments in which realism's assumed stability, objectivity and rationality become ruptured, I will explore the pathological, the hysterical, and the repulsive attraction of the real as it falls beyond the category of reason.

Gervex's realist portrait at the 1887 Salon

Doctor Péan, a surgeon of great celebrity and controversy, commissioned Gervex to paint his portrait, most likely to celebrate and memorialise his acceptance into the Académie de Médecine in 1887 (Fig. 6). Hung in room thirteen, *Avant l'opération* initiated the series of medical images shown at the 1887 Salon. M. Desjardin described the painting as “une oeuvre à sensation”²²² and Charles Darcours wrote that, “M. Gervex accapare presque tout le bruit de la salle 13 avec son tableau.”²²³ As implied by the painting's longer title, *Avant l'opération: le Docteur Péan enseignant à l'hôpital Saint Louis sa découverte du pincement des vaisseaux*, this work depicts the doctor lecturing at the Hôpital Saint-Louis, a hospital in Paris that specialised in venereal and skin diseases. In this large painting, Péan is standing at the helm of the operating table, surrounded by assistants, colleagues and nurses. He is holding his celebrated invention, clamps that were attached to blood vessels in order to reduce the amount of blood leaving the body during surgery, in one hand, while he gestures to the attentive crowd with his other. Of equal importance to the picture, Gervex painted a medical still life to Péan's right: surgical instruments are scattered around the tabletop, a spiky metal tool pierces a fleshy yellow sponge as other sponges rest safely in a labelled jar, droplets of blood stain the white table cloth, and closer to Péan, thin surgical utensils lie used in bloody water, while other instruments are placed with their shiny handles facing out, ready for use. The emphasis and immediacy of the still life contributed to establishing this painting as a realist work since still life was a realist genre *par excellence*. Beneath the representation of Péan, Gervex painted the body of a pale young woman, bare to the waist. The white of her naked flesh and enveloping sheets contrasts with the black cloth of the tailored suits and hospital uniforms. The minute details, evident in the still life in the foreground, the rendering of daylight as it falls through the windows, and the depiction of a modern

²²² M. Desjardin, “A travers le Salon”, *La République Française*, 30 April 1887, pp. 1-2.

²²³ Charles Darcours, “Beaux-Arts et Théâtre”, *Le Journal illustré*, 8 May 1887, p. 146.

medical scene made contemporary critics comment that Gervex's work was a painting of utmost realism.

Critics used characteristics most often associated with scientific objectivity, and usually attributed to men of science, to comment on realist artists and paintings. For example, G. Lafenestre praised Gervex for "n'inventer personnellement en aucune façon ni dans l'éclairage de la salle, ni dans la disposition des figures, ni dans le groupement des accessoires, c'est de rester, en un mot, le pur et simple copiste de la réalité..."²²⁴ M. Hamel also commended Gervex for painting a work without "aucune intention tragique ou larmoyante" that kept "l'éloquence de la vérité." He further wrote that, "Nul mystère, rien qui vise l'émotion: tout est dit simplement avec la certitude de la science quand elle affirme."²²⁵ For these critics, realism, like the scientific method, was equated with impartiality and neutrality, and therefore Gervex's apparent lack of involvement in the painting was one of its greatest achievements. Through his attention to detail, smooth modelling of bodies, and depiction of a contemporary scene, Gervex constructed a modern image whose painted surface was considered to be as clinical as its subject matter. For nineteenth-century critics, Gervex's realism replaced the idealization of academic painting through an aesthetic that symbolized a more precise, exact and objective understanding of the visible world.

Louis de Fourcaud argued in his lengthy account of the 1887 Salon in *La Revue Illustré* that the only two essential laws of art are "la sincérité dans l'observation, et, dans l'exécution, la logique."²²⁶ De Fourcaud described Gervex as a realist painter, and commended *Avant l'opération* for having a "sentiment juste de la situation, attitude naturelle, harmonie sobre, effet franc, nullement mélodramatique."²²⁷ De Fourcaud's comments reflect the prominent nineteenth-century assumption that the scientific characteristics of rationality, logic and reason took form in subtle coloration, subdued light effects, intricate details and lack of dramatization. The aestheticization of scientific principles within the artistic sphere reveals the ways in which scientific language and metaphors were used to empower artistic discourse. The appropriation of scientific thought, and the desire to observe and record the visible world, replaced art's connection with subjectivity, mythology and unrestrained creativity with the seemingly more

²²⁴ Lafenestre, Georges. "1887 Salon", *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 81, 1 June 1887, p. 586.

²²⁵ M. Hamel, "Le Salon de 1887", *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 1887, p. 479.

²²⁶ Louis de Fourcaud, "Le Salon de 1887", *La Revue Illustré*, I, p. 314.

²²⁷ de Fourcaud, p. 323.

concrete contemporary world in which calculation, documentation, and innovation reigned.

De Fourcaud's insistence on the superiority of realistic representations in the modern age was maintained in his article on contemporary art at the *Exposition Universelle* of 1889, where Gervex's work was again displayed. He wrote that he would accept any subject in painting as long as artists painted, "des personnages vrais en des actions vraies, dans des milieux vrais, éclairés de la même lumière qui nous enveloppe, respirant le même air que nous respirons. Donnez-nous la vérité..."²²⁸ Gervex created this sense of reality pictorially through the use of style and narrative and produced an image that was accepted as a truthful account of an actual event. The medical theme as staged within the painting provided the viewer with a direct and seemingly unproblematic access to this 'actual' event, while the smooth brushstrokes, delineated figures and naturalistic lighting provided the painting with an easy 'readability' and apparent equivalence to the visible world. That many viewers were convinced of the reality of this scene is evident in Roger Ballu's review of *Avant l'opération*, in which he claimed that it seemed as if the viewer was a part of the scene depicted. He wrote:

Il est impossible de donner mieux l'impression d'un jour d'intérieur, de cette atmosphère impalpable, éclairée par la fenêtre aux rideaux blanc relevés, modelant de reflets froids les visages, et circulant sur les murs nus de la salle d'hôpital. Ce qu'il y a d'air dans cette perspective restreinte, en somme, est inimaginable. On y pénètre, on y est, on y respire.²²⁹

The ease with which Ballu accepted Gervex's painting as a stand-in for reality reflects the nineteenth-century belief that realistic representations were in fact truthful and trustworthy depictions of actual events. Michael Fried has acutely argued, through his examination of Thomas Eakin's medical portrait *The Gross Clinic* of 1875, that there is an essential fault with the understanding that realist paintings are accurate recordings of reality because the only evidence of the original situation or point of view is the painting itself.²³⁰ Fried further points out that:

by limiting the role of (conscious or unconscious) intention to an initial choice of subject and point of view plus a general will to realism, it implies a prejudicial conception of the realist project as merely photographic, by which I mean that it

²²⁸ de Fourcaud, "L'Art Contemporain – École Française", *Revue de l'Exposition Universelle 1889* (Paris, 1889), p. 5.

²²⁹ Ballu, n.p.

²³⁰ Michael Fried, *Realism, Writing, Disfiguration in Thomas Eakins and Stephen Crane* (Chicago, 1987), p. 63.

interprets pictorial realism according to a certain model, itself prejudicial, of photography.²³¹

By disregarding the essential subjectivity and role of the artist in the production of realist paintings, and by imbuing Gervex's canvas with a greater claim to recording reality sincerely because of its photograph-like surface and minute rendering of specific details, many critics at the 1887 Salon maintained and propagated the belief in the objectivity of realist artists.

The desire to have a work of art understood as a truthful document of an historic event was also propagated by Gervex, himself, who in his memoirs declared that:

C'était l'époque où la découverte de la pince hémostatique révolutionnait les anciennes méthodes. Le docteur Péan, debout devant le corps endormi d'une jeune femme qu'il allait opérer, parlait, tenant entre ses doigts la fameuse pince. En un clin d'oeil j'aperçus le tableau à faire; je pris quelques croquis et j'abandonnai définitivement le banal profil du portrait classique.²³²

Gervex referred to the act of sketching from life in order to construct his experience of watching Péan as immediate and unmediated. Unlike painting, which took hours of contemplation and thought, sketching appeared more closely linked to reality, as it was executed in the presence of the model. The lines and brisk marks of a drawn sketch made a claim to immediacy that competed with the smooth painted surface and modelled figures in more 'finished' Salon painting. The limits of each medium to represent reality become more apparent when they are compared. Gervex constructed himself as part of modernity's revolution by linking his artistic innovations in portraiture with Péan's medical invention. As is evident in this statement, Gervex believed that his representation of a medical man needed to change along with the newfound technologies of modern scientific medicine. This helped construct him as both a witness to, and participant in, modern scientific and artistic progress. Gervex constructed himself as a modern realist painter not only by a rejection of certain artistic conventions and formal practices, such as the "banal profile du portrait classique", but also by emphasizing the actuality and contemporaneity of events that he himself witnessed.

Scientific medicine was regarded as a key element of modernity. Baudelaire had already invoked the anatomy theatre as an appropriate pretext for modern nudes in his

²³¹ Fried (1987), p. 64.

²³² Henri Gervex. *Souvenir: Henri Gervex recueilles par Jules Bertaut* (Paris, 1924), p. 252.

1846 essay “The Heroism of Modern Life.”²³³ Medical scenes were considered ideal subjects for realist paintings. In 1887, Darcours praised the medical theme of *Avant l’opération*: “C’est une peinture intéressante et dont le thème réaliste est préférable aux sujets galants trop souvent traités par un artiste du grand talent.”²³⁴ Like the laboratory in Gsell’s portrait of Pasteur and the clinic in Brouillet’s *Une Leçon Clinique*, the operating theatre was regarded as a location of modernity. It was the venue of modern surgical experimentation and the site in which scientific discoveries were made and innovations were used. The increased use of asepsis and anaesthetics during the 1880s greatly increased the survival rates of patients who went under the knife, and transformed surgery into a more humane and painless procedure. Although Gervex painted a few speckles of blood on the white table cloth in the foreground of *Avant l’opération*, there are no signs of blood on the sheets covering the operating table, nor staining the clothing of the medical men. The operating theatre was shown as a clean and ordered space filled with modern technologies and hygienic advancements as is evident by the chloroform cloth near the patient’s face, newly invented tools soaking in a water-filled bowl, the contemporary operating table and Péan’s up-to-date scientific instruments. Although Péan did not fully adhere to Joseph Lister’s conception of asepsis (he did not use carbolic acid during surgery), he was still considered progressive because he insisted on washing his instruments and his hands before surgery.²³⁵ Gervex’s detailed rendering of this scene exhibited the artist’s familiarity not only with the operating theatre itself, but with the modern methods of Péan and scientific medicine.

Gervex’s conscious desire to be associated with scientific medicine first emerged at the beginning of his career when he painted a medical theme in *Autopsie à l’Hôtel-Dieu* (Fig. 80). As noted in Larousse’s *Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIXe siècle*, this work helped establish Gervex’s identity as a modern painter: “M. Gervex aborda, en 1876, avec *L’autopsie à l’Hôtel-Dieu*, les sujets modernes qui devaient établir sa réputation et le placer au rang des artistes les plus en vue de la jeune école.”²³⁶ This painting depicts three men standing around a cadaver in a cavernous but brightly lit dissection room: a man with a bushy moustache looks down on a dead body while

²³³ Charles Baudelaire, “The Heroism is Modern Life”, from the Salon of 1846. See Charles Baudelaire, *Art in Paris, 1845-1862: Salons and other exhibitions*, Jonathan Mayne (ed, trans.), (London, 1967), pp. 47-52.

²³⁴ Darcours, p. 146.

²³⁵ For a history of antiseptic surgery and Lister’s use of asepsis, see Bynum, pp. 112-114, 132-137.

²³⁶ Pierre Larousse, *Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIXe siècle [Deuxième Supplément]*, p. 1314.

holding the slab steady, a bearded man grips the specimen's thigh and makes an incision, and another male figure watches the procedure while rolling a cigarette. Salon critics praised the accuracy of this work. M. Charles Yriarte wrote that, "...on doit lui savoir gré de la franchise de son exécution et de la sincérité qui règne dans son oeuvre. La lumière frise les objets et elle pénètre les corps, ses attitudes sont justes, son dessin est honnête et ses moyens sont francs."²³⁷ Gervex further emphasized the contemporaneity of the painting by writing that he came across the scene while on a "flâneurie".²³⁸ By describing himself as a man who wanders around the streets of Paris, Gervex aligned himself with Baudelaire's *flâneur* – a male type that signified the modernity of Paris. Such a statement emphasized both the immediacy of Gervex's personal experience and the reality of the scene itself. It also contributed to Gervex's identity as a 'painter of modern life'. Gervex's conscious desire to be recognized as a modern artist is evident by his claim that he had applied "le plus complètement ma théorie de l'art moderne" to *Autopsie à l'Hôtel-Dieu*, and that he gave it "une note toute neuve".²³⁹ The celebration of modern French medicine through realistic representations was praised and rewarded. Significantly, Gervex won a second place medal for *Autopsie à l'Hôtel-Dieu* at the 1876 Salon and his painting was bought by the State to be exhibited at the Musée de Limoges.²⁴⁰ Pierre Véron applauded the work, claiming that:

...dans cette oeuvre importante, M. Gervex s'est surpassé. Les carabins vivent, dissèquent, écoutent les leçons d'un Broca ou d'un Clément, et semblent en profiter avec l'amour de la science qui caractérise ces utiles chercheurs.²⁴¹

As is evident in Véron's text, medical themes were deemed worthy subjects for important French paintings. By returning to a medical theme again in 1887, Gervex was able to build on his past success by creating another painting that was considered modern in subject matter, style and approach.

²³⁷ As cited in Larousse, p. 1314.

²³⁸ Gervex wrote that, "Ce sujet réaliste entre tous n'avait pas été choisi par moi, il m'avait été fourni par le hasard. J'avais découverte, au cours de mes flâneries, la salle d'autopsie du vieil Hôtel-Dieu comme les Parisiens découvrent les coins pittoresques ou peu connus de leur ville. Et j'avais été bouleversé de ma trouvaille..." Gervex, p. 26. For a discussion of Gervex's approach to painting, see Petra ten-Doesschate Chu "Into the Modern Era: The Evolution of Realist and Naturalist Drawing" in Gabriel P. Weisberg, *The Realist Tradition: French Painting and Drawing 1830-1900* (Indiana, 1980), p. 292.

²³⁹ Gervex, p. 26.

²⁴⁰ de Bélinas recounted in his 1883 book on contemporary artists that, "En 1876, *L'autopsie à l'Hôtel-Dieu*, qui a fit crier quelque peu, c'était si réaliste, mais le jury ne fut pas de cet avis et Gervex fut mis hors concours par un rappel de second médaille." A.-M de Bélinas *Nos Peintres Dessinés par eux-mêmes – notes humoristique et esquisses biographique* (Paris, 1883), p. 53.

²⁴¹ P. Véron, "Le Salon de 1876", *Annuaire Véron* (Limoges, 1876), p. 43 as cited in Jean-Christophe Gourvennec, "Apprentissage et success: les années 70" in *Henri Gervex*, ex.cat, Galeries des Beaux-Arts (Bordeaux, 1992), pp. 99-100.

Front Row Seats:

Identity, Republicanism and Spectatorship in Group Portraiture

Gervex's representation of Péan staged modern masculinity and medicine, using the genre of portraiture to symbolize status, authority, nationality and patriotism. As Victorien Maubry commented in his 1887 Salon review in *Le Témoin*, portraits should be considered solely as "une source de gloire et de profit."²⁴² In *Avant l'opération*, Péan is represented showing both his surgical skills and his signatory invention. From title, image and genre, it is evident that this was the painting's main goal. The success of this strategy is evident in an article in *Paris Illustré* that noted that the sole purpose of the painting was to "conserver le souvenir de l'invention de la célèbre méthode chirurgicale de M. le Dr Péan."²⁴³ Some Salon reviewers criticised *Avant l'opération* because they thought it was made solely to publicize Péan's skills. *L'Univers Illustré* noted that this painting should have been titled *Portrait de Docteur Péan*, and their cartoon, which depicted Péan's head as twice the size of all the other figures, reveals how this painting was considered an egotistical platform for the doctor (Fig. 81).²⁴⁴ Such comments are of particular importance because Péan's identity as the inventor of the homeostatic clamps was highly controversial. The question of who invented the clamps was discussed in both the popular and medical press during the 1880s as well as in Péan's obituaries of 1898.²⁴⁵ The controversy arose when a certain Doctor Verneuil claimed that his discovery of *forcipressure* – applying pressure to blood vessels in order to restrict blood flow – preceded Péan's invention. Péan, who referred to his own invention as *pincement des vaisseaux*, dismissed Verneuil's claim by arguing that pinching and pressure were in fact the same thing and by insisting that his pinching came before Verneuil's pressure. Although the controversy continued in medical circles until Péan's death, Péan's identification with homeostatic clamps, like Pasteur's association with finding the cure for rabies, was secured historically with the help of a Salon portrait. The conscious construction of Péan as inventor was further emphasized in the painting because Péan is the only one depicted holding the clamps even though in a study for the painting, M.

²⁴² Victorien Maubry, "Le Salon", *Le Témoin*, 16 May, 1887, pp. 41-42.

²⁴³ "Avant l'Opération: Tableau de M. Gervex (Salon de 1887)", *Paris Illustré*, 28 May 1887, p. 76.

²⁴⁴ "Le Salon", *L'Univers Illustré*, 7 May 1887, p. 295.

²⁴⁵ For nineteenth-century accounts of the invention of homeostatic clamps, see "Avant l'Opération: Tableau de M. Gervex (Salon de 1887)", *Paris Illustré*, 28 May 1887, p. 76, and A.C., "Le Docteur Péan", *La Chronique Médicale – Revue bi-mensuelle de médecine, historique, littéraire et anecdotique*, 15 February, 1898, p. 8. For a recent discussion of the scandal, see Knut Haeger, *Illustrated History of Surgery* (London, 2000), pp. 200-201.

Mathieu, the manufacturer of this surgical instrument, was drawn with them in his hand (Fig 82). In the oil painting, Mathieu looks on empty handed even though his left hand remained poised as it is in the sketch. By commissioning a portrait, particularly one painted by a popular member of the Academy who no longer had to put his works before the Jury, Péan was able to exploit the authority and tradition of the Salon to construct himself as the unquestionable creator. The authenticity of Péan as inventor was further propagated by the painting's display at the *Exposition Universelle* of 1889, in which it represented the progress of French advances, both artistic and medical.²⁴⁶

Péan's unrelenting desire to parade his professional prowess and personal wealth through representations of his body is also evident at the Montmartre cemetery, where a large portrait bust of the surgeon is placed above the door to his tomb (Fig. 84). In this bust, Péan is represented with a straightforward gaze, his chin raised and his signature bushy sideburns covering his cheeks. Like the depiction of Péan in *Avant l'opération*, where he is shown wearing the red pin of the *Légion d'honneur* on his left lapel, this bust represents Péan as a focused patriot, as is evident by his serious expression and the large cross of the *Légion d'honneur* resting prominently below his clavicle. Péan's heroic role in society was not only displayed by this portrait bust, the large letters spelling out his name above the tomb's door and by the grandeur of the tomb itself, but was also exhibited within the tomb where Péan's numerous titles and professional affiliations are engraved in marble (Fig. 85). The stone tablet lists Péan as a member of the medical academies of Paris, Saint Petersburg, Constantinople, Madrid, Lisbon, Rio de Janeiro and Mexico. It also mentions that he was the *Chirurgien honoraire des hôpitaux de Paris*, *Chirurgien des maisons de la Légion d'honneur* and founder of the Hospital International. Like many representations of Pasteur, particularly Gsell's 1887 portrait of the chemist surrounded by both French and foreign patients, Péan's tomb constructs the importance of medical science and its practitioners not only in France, but internationally. Above this text-filled marble square is a large stained glass window portraying Christ's resurrection (Fig. 86). Christ is shown rising from the tomb accompanied by an angel while Roman soldiers are shown dispersed on the ground, awe-struck and powerless. The juxtaposition of religious iconography and medical identity within the tomb implied that Péan had a close relationship with the divine, if not suggesting that Péan himself had god-like abilities. Connections were drawn between modern scientific medicine and the work

²⁴⁶ For a discussion of *Avant l'opération* at the Exposition Universelle of 1889, see Walton, pp. 87-88.

of God, as Péan and other scientific professionals were considered celestial in their ability to cure bodies and prevent impending death. As written by Docteur G. Rappin around 1895, “La Science est une; elle est comme Dieu universelle. La Religion vieillit, la Science grandit. La Science est la mère de toute liberté. Pauvre Science! Si l’on faisait pour toi un peu seulement de ce que l’on fait pour la religion! Où sont tes autels?”²⁴⁷ In Gervex’s canvas and in the tomb, light shines through windows to illuminate Péan’s professional feats, suggesting that the divine light of heaven and the rational enlightenment of modern science both lit his path.

Gervex was also interested in constructing his own identity through his portrait of Péan. He represented himself as a modern man of science by inserting himself pictorially into the contemporary scene of Péan’s surgical theatre as both a documenter of reality and as a witness to scientific medical progress. This is evident by his painterly marks, and the surgical tools and still life he painted in the foreground. As Georges Ollendorf wrote, Gervex symbolically put himself in the painting through the painterly attention he paid to the objects depicted in the canvas:

Ici l’ironie ne pouvant pas se mettre dans la scène, M. Gervex l’a glissée dans les accessoires. Notre oeil s’est trouvé invinciblement arêté par lui, non pas sur le personnage principal, celui qu’il s’agit d’opérer, non pas sur le personnage secondaire, mais dont le rôle est encore important, l’opérateur; mais sur une table où figure les accessoires de l’opération, quelques instruments épars – et un merveilleux bocal d’éponges.²⁴⁸

These tools, signifiers of Péan’s revolutionary role in modern medicine, also become emblems of the artist’s hand, as they symbolize Gervex’s paintbrush and palette. The skills of Gervex as a painter, and those of Péan as a surgeon are linked pictorially, connecting the two men as modern skilled professionals. Gervex’s blood red signature beneath the empty stool implies his bodily presence and importance in the scene. The choice of red for the signature interrupts the subtle colours of the painting’s realist effect, thus connecting Gervex’s name with the red labels of the jars, the spots of blood staining the white table cloth and the red *Légion d’honneur* pin attached to Péan’s lapel. Here, blood, honour and order stand not only as emblems of modern surgery, but compositionally create a space for both Gervex and the viewer’s body (Fig. 87). This demarcation simultaneously locates both Gervex and the implied viewer at the head of

²⁴⁷ Doctor Gustave Rappin, “Pensées”, c. 1895 as cited in Jacques Léonard, *La France Médicale au XIXe Siècle* (Paris, 1978), p. 240.

²⁴⁸ Georges Ollendorf, *Salon de 1887* (Paris, 1887), p. 51.

the operating table, providing visual priority and direct contact to both Péan and the operation at hand. The life-sized figures depicted in the canvas and the open space offered to the viewer at the head of the operating table contributed to critics' understanding of the painting as a realist work, as both artist and viewer are constructed as witnesses to, and participants in, modernity.

Although *Avant l'opération* was described as a modern painting by Salon critics, Gervex consciously engaged with previous artistic conventions for painting a medical theme as well as actively attempted to create a modern medical iconography. Looking to the past, he rejected the single portrait format that he had used in his portrait of Doctor Blanche from around 1880 (Fig. 88). For Péan's portrait, he created a large-scale group painting showing professional men in action. Such a format made many contemporary observers comment that it appeared as a modern rendition of Rembrandt's medical group portraits, such as his *Anatomy lesson of Doctor Tulp* of 1632. Paul Mantz referred to Gervex and Brouillet's paintings as "plus ou moins parents de ces Leçons d'anatomie que la Hollande du dix-septième siècle a tant aimées et dont Rembrandt a fourni deux modèles inégalement fameux."²⁴⁹ Roger Ballu made a similar comment when he wrote, "C'est en somme le sujet de *La Leçon d'anatomie* de Rembrandt mis au point de la vérité moderne, et il faut savoir gré à M. Gervex d'avoir été aussi sincère, aussi exact à son époque que le maître hollandais a dû être à la sienne."²⁵⁰ Rembrandt-themed paintings were very popular at the Salons. As Alison McQueen discusses in her recent book on the cult of Rembrandt during the nineteenth century, artists painted fictional scenes from Rembrandt's life: Tony François de Bergue displayed his work *Rembrandt painting the Anatomy Lesson* at the 1861 Salon and Christoffel Bisschop's showed his *Rembrandt going to paint the Anatomy Lesson* in 1866.²⁵¹

Although there were no painted Dutch group portraits in France during the nineteenth century, reproductions of these works were plentiful and became more fashionable than Dutch landscape and genre painting from the 1830s onward. The rise in value of Rembrandt's work, along with an increase in the number of his paintings and prints sold, attests to the popularity of his art in France.²⁵² The improved facilities for

²⁴⁹ Paul Mantz, "Le Salon – I", *Le Temps*, 8 May 1887. Mantz referred to Rembrandt's *Anatomy lesson of Doctor Tulp* and *Anatomy lesson of Doctor Joan Deyman*.

²⁵⁰ Ballu, n.p.

²⁵¹ Alison McQueen, *The rise of the cult of Rembrandt: Reinventing an Old Master in nineteenth-century France* (Amsterdam, 2003), pp. 148-151.

²⁵² Petra Ten Doesschate Chu, like McQueen, offers a detailed account of the influence of seventeenth-century Dutch art on nineteenth-century French artistic practice. See Chu, *French Realism and the Dutch*

travel from France to the Netherlands further promoted the study of Dutch art. As is evident by the numerous nineteenth-century French books on Rembrandt, French artists were familiar with Rembrandt's work and seventeenth-century Dutch group portraiture.²⁵³ Significantly, most critics who praised nineteenth-century French art that was considered realist also praised seventeenth-century Dutch painting, Rembrandt in particular. They believed that Dutch artists were equally concerned with producing sincere representations of visible reality. Paul Lenoir described Rembrandt and seventeenth-century Dutch painting in his book *Histoire du Réalisme et du Naturalisme dans la poésie et dans l'art depuis l'antiquité jusqu'à nos jours* published in 1889: "Le sujet, d'ailleurs fort connu, n'exigeant d'autre invention que celle de l'ordonnance, et nul idéal, convenait merveilleusement au génie réaliste du peintre de *Gueux*."²⁵⁴ A similar perspective was also given by Louis Viardot, who wrote in 1860 that Rembrandt "marque bien l'extrême hauteur du pur 'naturalisme.'"²⁵⁵ At least 150 prints after Rembrandt were available in France between 1830 and 1890s, and from the mid-1880s, these prints dominated the Salon.²⁵⁶ Léopold Flameng's engraving of Rembrandt's *Anatomy Lesson of Doctor Tulp*, published by Cadart and first shown at the 1876 Salon, was one of the most exhibited and well distributed prints (Fig. 90).²⁵⁷ Significantly, the engraving presents a reversed mirror image of the Dutch master's painting and therefore is compositionally similar to the medical theme painted by Gervex.

Both *Avant l'opération* and *Anatomy lesson of Doctor Tulp* are representations of medical men in professional spaces. They are similar in narrative and composition as both depict darkly-suited men standing around naked immobile bodies. The unconscious and unclothed figures are concurrently represented as the objects of art and science: their horizontal dominance in the canvases is evidence of the naked body's central role in the paintings' narratives and compositions as well as its importance in medical study and the production of medical knowledge. The connections drawn between nineteenth-century French art and seventeenth-century Dutch painting went beyond superficial formal

Masters: The Influence of Dutch Seventeenth-Century Painting on the Development of French Painting between 1830-1870 (Utrecht, 1974).

²⁵³ For examples of nineteenth-century French writing on seventeenth-century Dutch art and Rembrandt see Marcel Nicolle *Rembrandt: Aux expositions d'Amsterdam et de Londres* (Paris, 1899), Emile Michel *Rembrandt: Sa vie, son oeuvre et son temps* (Paris, 1893) and Emile Leclercq *L'art est rationnel* (Brussels, 1882).

²⁵⁴ Paul Lenoir, *Histoire du Réalisme et du Naturalisme dans la poésie et dans l'art depuis l'antiquité jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris, 1889), p. 563.

²⁵⁵ Louis Viardot, *Les Musées de France* (Paris, 1860), p. 148.

²⁵⁶ McQueen, pp. 15, 264.

²⁵⁷ McQueen, p. 266.

strategies. Many nineteenth-century French art critics, art historians and theorists believed that ideological and political thought could be articulated through visual means. The similarities between French and Dutch group portraiture were thought to stand for transhistorical alliances and worldviews. By considering Gervex's painting in relation to Alois Riegl's 1902 key work on group portraiture, *Das holländische Gruppenporträt* (The Dutch Group Portrait), it is evident that scholars turned to the past in order to understand and find a visual language that could help them explain their present.

Although Riegl's study of group portraiture was printed in German fifteen years after the 1887 Salon, his approach to the visual arts shares similar concerns with nineteenth-century French artists and critics regarding portraiture, realism and politics. Riegl, like many nineteenth-century French critics, was interested in the relationship between aesthetics and historical periods. In 1863, Baudelaire addressed this relationship when he wrote that:

Il y a eu une modernité pour chaque peintre ancien; la plupart des beaux portraits qui nous restent des temps antérieurs sont revêtus des costumes de leur époque. Ils sont parfaitement harmonieux, parce que le costume, la coiffure et même le geste, le regard et le sourire (chaque époque a son port, son regard et son sourire) forment un tout d'une complète vitalité.²⁵⁸

Art was understood to be reflective of particular epochs as much as it was considered a product and producer of that culture. As McQueen convincingly argues, most French art critics believed that seventeenth-century Dutch art was a mirror of Dutch society, morals, politics and values; the art critic Charles Blanc wrote in his 1883 book *L'école Hollandaise*, "une galerie de peintres hollandaise est une histoire complète de la Hollande du beau siècle, une histoire à la fois morale, politique, naturelle."²⁵⁹ Riegl's similar approach to art history was informed by his nineteenth-century positivist education at the University of Vienna, which, like many French artists and critics, followed the belief that scientific methodologies could provide a solution to humanistic and social concerns.²⁶⁰ Riegl conceived art and art history through the concept of *Kunstwollen*, often translated as 'the will of art.' The *Kunstwollen* was understood to be evident in historical periods, genres, traditions and artists as manifestations of that culture and thought; it ran parallel

²⁵⁸ Charles Baudelaire, "Le peintre de la vie moderne – IV. La modernité", *Le Figaro*, (Paris, 1963).

²⁵⁹ Charles Blanc, *L'école Hollandaise* (Paris, 1883), p. 12.

²⁶⁰ For an account of Riegl's education and relationship to positivism and realism, see Margaret Olin, *Forms of Representation in Alois Riegl's Theory of Art* (Pennsylvania, 1992), pp. 3-16.

to the ideas and views associated with a particular historical period and its people.²⁶¹ As Frauke Laarman states, “*Kunstwollen* in the visual arts regulates the relationship between human beings and the appearance of things as perceived by the senses: it generates the means of expression, how that individual wishes to see those things shaped or coloured.”²⁶² Riegl focused on Dutch group portraiture from the early sixteenth through the mid-seventeenth century in *Das holländische Gruppenporträt* because he believed that group portraiture was the most comprehensive expression of the Dutch *Kunstwollen*. Through the conception of *Kunstwollen*, Riegl argued that certain pictorial elements in Dutch art, such as the representation of gestures, the placement of figures and the compositional integration of the spectator into the portrait, were representative of social, historical and political changes within Dutch society, particularly the shift towards a more secular, individualist and mercantile society.

Of particular interest to Riegl was the way in which, he argued, the coherence of seventeenth-century Dutch portraits lay not only in the objects themselves but also in the consciousness of the spectator who was needed to complete the scene. In many Dutch group portraits, such as Rembrandt’s *Anatomy lesson of Doctor Tulp*, the figures represented in the paintings not only interact with one another but also actively bring the viewer into the time and space depicted in the canvas through hand gestures and eye contact, thus creating a continuity of time and space between the represented figures and the spectator.²⁶³ Both Gervex’s and Rembrandt’s portraits have viewing positions for the spectator that give the viewer unrestricted access to the painting’s main action. In order to create obvious central viewing positions for the spectator, Rembrandt framed his foreground with two figures to the left and a large book to the right. Gervex did the same with the still life on the left and the medic on the right. The majority of the figures represented in both paintings are positioned behind the naked bodies so that the viewer can occupy the frontal viewing position. Significantly, neither the representation of Tulp nor Péan creates eye contact with any figures depicted in the canvas, nor do they look directly out at the viewer. Both Péan and Tulp gaze out at audiences that are not depicted

²⁶¹ For discussions of Riegl’s concept of *Kunstwollen* see Margaret Iversen, *Alois Riegl: Art History and Theory* (Cambridge, Mass, 1993) and Richard Woodfield (ed), *Framing Formalism: Riegl’s Work* (Amsterdam, 2000), particularly Frauke Laarman, “Riegl and the Family Portrait”, pp. 195-218 and Benjamin Binstock “I’ve got you under my skin: Rembrandt, Riegl, and the Will of Art History”, pp. 219-264.

²⁶² Laarman, p. 199.

²⁶³ For an in-depth discussion of Riegl’s concept of ‘attention’ and the role of the spectator see Iversen pp. 101-147.

within the portraits. Yet rather than isolate the viewer by their lack of direct engagement, their distinct gazes outside of the represented space ultimately construct a more three-dimensional world for the spectator: the beholder is embodied within a surrounding scene rather than merely witness to the represented two-dimensional picture. The viewer is 'sandwiched' between the figures depicted in the canvas and the audience that is implied by the doctors' active looks.

Although neither Péan nor Tulp occupy a much greater space than the other clothed bodies in the paintings, both men are shown as leading figures through the representation of their hands, which simultaneously hold medical tools and gesture. Benjamin Binstock argues that the hand motif in Doctor Tulp symbolizes the priority of sight over speech as a vehicle for human understanding.²⁶⁴ The same can be said in relation to *Avant l'opération*, where the looking and touching of bodies is made paramount. Sight was essential for learning surgical procedures and acquiring medical knowledge, yet of greater significance was the synchronization of sight and touch, as hands were also indispensable in surgery. Surgeons, like artists, required acute hand-eye coordination in order to successfully fulfil their professional roles. Riegl discussed the importance of hands in Dutch group portraiture, claiming that hand gestures were able to represent mental expressions as they allowed the figures within the canvas to communicate to one another and to the portrait's beholder. Riegl proposed that the active role of the spectator and the everyday events depicted in the Dutch portraits allowed art to transcend its historical context as these compositionally produced open spaces allowed the viewer to become an integral part of the portrait. Time and space became continuous to the spectator. Although Rembrandt's portrait does not provide a detailed representation of the surrounding surgical space like Gervex's does, the active involvement demanded of the viewer in both paintings contributed to the portraits' claims to truth and reality.

The sense of reality is further increased through the instantaneity produced by both of the images. Rather than show one historically significant moment, such as a royal crowning or the winning of a specific military victory, both Gervex and Rembrandt represented everyday events in professional medical life. This can be seen to relate to Riegl's notion that Dutch portraiture was genre-like. He wrote that Dutch portraits did

²⁶⁴ Binstock, p. 226. For a further discussion of Doctor Tulp's hand gesture, see William Schupbach's *The Paradox of Rembrandt's 'Anatomy of Dr. Tulp'* (London, 1982), which claims that Tulp's hand shows the operation of the exposed tendons of the corpse's hand.

not represent “an historical event that took place in the past but rather an oft-repeated one whose very meaning lies in this frequent, typical repetition; in a word, a genre-like event.”²⁶⁵ Riegl stressed that Dutch portraiture was genre-like because it gradually moved away from the fixed action and time of history painting. This supported his view that Dutch art became increasingly concerned with creating convincing representations of instantaneity.²⁶⁶ Gervex also created this sense of immediacy in his work. The casual gestures of the figures and the tools in the still life, which threaten to fall off the table, invoke the feeling that Gervex has stopped a moment in time. The ease with which the figures perform their professional actions creates a sense of familiarity and unity thus making the viewer feel like a part of this event.

Riegl argued that the active participation of spectators in everyday scenes in seventeenth-century Dutch group portraiture was reflective of the republican values in Dutch society. As Margaret Iversen points out, Riegl was influenced by the writing of Théophile Thoré, a dedicated French republican who wrote his art criticism under the pseudonym William Bürger after his exile from France in 1848. Thoré discussed not only the concept of an implied viewer but expressed his belief that Dutch art embodied the principles of political and religious freedom - ideals that were valued and deemed essential for a republican France.²⁶⁷ This sentiment was also felt by Émile Leclercq, who wrote in 1882 that, “toute l’art hollandaise est d’essence populaire et démocratique.”²⁶⁸ The historic and artistic parallels between the secularization of late nineteenth-century France and seventeenth-century Holland are also evident in Emile Michel’s account of art and politics during the seventeenth century in Holland in his book *Rembrandt – Sa Vie, Son Oeuvre et son temps* of 1893. Michel wrote that:

Après le triomphe définitif de la Réforme dans les Pays-Bas, la peinture religieuse, celle du moins qui avait pour objet la décoration des églises, n’existait plus. En même temps que le clergé catholique disparaissait, la cour cessait de patronner les artistes; mais les corporations, en prenant la place ainsi laissée vacante, allaient ouvrir des voies nouvelles à l’activité des peintres hollandaise. Comme il était naturel de le penser, les chefs de ces associations se firent représenter revêtus des insignes de leur dignité, et leurs portraits placés dans les salles de réunion étaient pour les affiliés autant d’exhortations à continuer les

²⁶⁵ Riegl, *The Dutch Group Portrait*, (Vienna, 1931), p. 85 as cited in Iversen footnote 15, p. 109.

²⁶⁶ Iversen, p. 109.

²⁶⁷ See Théophile Thoré’s account in his *Musées de la Hollande: I Amsterdam et la Haye-Études sur l’école hollandaise, II Musée van der Hoop à Amsterdam, et Musée de Rotterdam* (Paris, 1858 and 1860) and his article “Nouvelles tendances de l’art” in *Salon de Théophile Thoré 1844, 1845, 1847, 1848* (Paris, 1868). For an account of Thoré in relation to Riegl, see Iversen, p. 128.

²⁶⁸ Émile Leclercq, *Caractères de l’École française moderne de peinture* (Brussels, 1881), p. 151.

exemples de dévouement, de patriotisme ou de charité que leur avaient donnés ces devanciers dont ils avaient sous les yeux les images.²⁶⁹

Although Michel did not make any overt reference to the similarities between seventeenth-century Holland and late nineteenth-century France, he praised the ‘triumph’ of the reformation and naturalised the shifting social positions taking place during this religious upheaval. In his text, it is only ‘natural’ that corporations and *chefs de ces associations* take on the role of the Church by commissioning artworks and by having their portraits publicly exhibited. The shift from church patronage to government commissions was also taking place during the Third Republic. The Republican government sponsored artists, such as Gervex, to paint secular themes in public buildings, and bourgeois professionals, including doctors, commissioned artists to paint their portraits – in both instances, such representations can be seen as both a reflection of this group’s new found status as well as their conscious creation of a republican identity and iconography.²⁷⁰

Gervex’s use of the group portrait, understood by Salon critics as being intimately tied to seventeenth-century Dutch group portraits, stood in for the anti-clerical and republican values shared by both himself and Péan.²⁷¹ Republicanism was seen by many to be rational and logical in contrast to the mysticism and faith regarded as inherent to Catholicism. Petra Ten Doesschate Chu has argued that after 1848 the French associated seventeenth-century Dutch art with the Reformation, revolution, and republican government.²⁷² In 1883, Charles Blanc claimed that the political independence of Holland allowed its art to progress towards a pure imitation of reality. He wrote, “La forme républicaine, une fois reconnue, les a délivrés de l’art purement décoratif que commandent les cours et les princes, de ce qu’on nomme la peinture d’apparat.”²⁷³ Thoré was perhaps the art critic who most ardently linked the republicanism of seventeenth-century Holland with that of nineteenth-century France. He argued that France needed to follow Holland’s lead and rid itself of both Catholicism and the monarchy if it wanted to

²⁶⁹ Michel, p. 122.

²⁷⁰ For an examination of Gervex’s republican state commissions see Jean-Christophe Gouvenec “La République triomphante: les années 90” pp. 164-189 and Roselyne Hurel “Le panorama de l’*Histoire du siècle 1789-1889* par Henri Gervex et Alfred Stevens” p. 190-205 in *Henri Gervex*.

²⁷¹ For a discussion of Péan’s republicanism see Doctor Aubeau, “La Psychologie de Péan”, *La Chronique Médicale – Revue bi-mensuelle de médecine, historique, littéraire et anecdotique*, 15 February, 1898, pp. 106-108.

²⁷² Chu (1974), p.14. Although Chu bases her assumptions primarily on historian Edgar Quinet’s texts from the mid-nineteenth century, it is evident that these associations, particularly the association between Dutch art and republicanism, were carried into the last decades of the nineteenth century.

²⁷³ Blanc, p. 19.

form a democratic republic.²⁷⁴ The sacred and aristocratic were considered archaic while the secular was believed to lead towards the successful future of a modern France. The secularisation of the hospital system, institutionalised during the Third Republic, was occurring simultaneously with the progress of modern scientific medicine.²⁷⁵ Unlike previous medicine that was implemented by nuns and priests, this new scientific medicine was executed by doctors and republican policies. Medical professionals were constructed as the embodiment of republicanism. As Jules Guérin, the editor of *La Gazette médicale de Paris* wrote, “Il est bien vrai que la profession médicale est d’essence libérale et républicaine, qu’elle façonne l’esprit à la haine du préjugé et à l’amour du progrès.”²⁷⁶ Gervex represented the lingering religious presence within the medical sphere through his representation of a nun.²⁷⁷ Segregated to a back corner, the nun’s identity and significance is represented by her black habit, a uniform associated with the spiritual past, which stands in opposition to the modern black suits of the male professionals.

Republican ideals are further inscribed in the painting through Péan’s representation as a surgeon, rather than an anatomist. Unlike anatomy, which was associated with intellectual capabilities, surgery was regarded as a more physical act. The desire to be portrayed as anatomists rather than surgeons is evident in François Nicolas Augustin Feyen-Perrin’s portrait *La Leçon d’anatomie de Docteur Velpeau* of 1864, in which Velpeau is shown as an anatomist even though he was also a practicing surgeon and physician (Fig. 91).²⁷⁸ His identity as an anatomist is represented not only by the dead body across the table, but also by the omission of any surgical tools. Unlike *Avant l’opération*, Feyen-Perrin’s painting does not attempt to define modern medicine, nor is Velpeau constructed as a modern surgeon: the setting represented in the painting is non-specific and timeless, and there are no modern tools or technologies on display. Although some of these omissions are rooted in the painting’s creation in 1864 – a time before certain medical procedures such as anaesthetics were commonly used – Velpeau’s representation is devoid of visual references to modern medicine. It is more similar to

²⁷⁴ See McQueen for a discussion of Thoré’s republican views, pp. 37-38, 109-121.

²⁷⁵ For accounts of the secularization of medicine in France see Jan Goldstein, *Console and Classify: The French Psychiatric Profession in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1987), Harris, Ruth, *Murders and Madness: Medicine, Law and Society in the Fin de Siècle* (Oxford, 1989) and Jack D. Ellis, *The Physician-Legislators of France: Medicine and Politics in the Early Third Republic, 1870-1914* (Cambridge, 1990).

²⁷⁶ Jules Guérin, *La Gazette médicale de Paris*, 4 March 1848 as cited in Léonard, p. 255.

²⁷⁷ For an account the institutional changes that affected nursing see Katrin Schultheiss, *Bodies and Souls: Politics and the Professionalization of Nursing in France, 1880-1922* (Cambridge, Mass., 2001).

²⁷⁸ For a discussion of the specialization of medicine see George Weisz “The development of medical specialization in nineteenth-century Paris” in LaBerge (ed) *French Medical Culture in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 149-188.

images that show medical men as anatomists, like those by Rembrandt as well as sixteenth-century pictures of the Flemish anatomist Andreas Vesalius. In contrast, Péan had himself represented as a modern surgeon because he wanted his class, social status, and modernity to be on view. It was commonly understood that surgeons came from modest backgrounds, fought competitively to be accepted into medical school, and once educated, achieved great social mobility. As Elizabeth Johns points out, French surgeons became “the very embodiment of Enlightenment values and egalitarian opportunities.”²⁷⁹ Péan was very proud of his past and, in turn, his success. The story of how he moved from rural France to become one of the richest, if not the richest, medical professional in Paris was documented in numerous publications.²⁸⁰ By simultaneously having himself pictorially represented as coming from working-class origins yet also using the genre of portraiture to symbolise his wealth and privilege, Péan was able to display the social mobility that republicanism and medicine appeared to offer. Although Gervex portrayed Péan as a surgeon, he did not depict the doctor in the act of surgery: there are only a few drops of blood, the white surgical aprons are unstained and the patient’s body is unscarred. Surgery here is depicted as an act of control, cleanliness and restraint rather than brute physicality. This helped construct Péan as a rational and skilled professional as surgery was represented without the display of blood or pain.

Although *Avant l’opération* is a group portrait because it contains individual portraits of various men who were known in the Parisian medical world, it constructs and privileges certain identities while erasing and diminishing others. Like Rembrandt’s *Anatomy Lesson of Doctor Tulp* and Brouillet’s representation of Charcot and his crowd, Gervex’s work was intended to be read as a group portrait. The men in the painting were named in some Salon reviews: young Doctor Zacharian checks the patient’s pulse, old Doctor Collin with his fuzzy white hair stares at Péan, the bearded Monsieur Matieu peeks out from behind the surgeon’s shoulder, and Doctor Arbeau holds a shiny white bowl. Yet unlike most seventeenth-century Dutch portraits, in which all of the figures depicted in the canvas were known and named, many figures in Gervex’s work were unidentified and nameless. When comparing *Avant l’opération* with *Autopsie à l’Hôtel-Dieu*, it is evident that Gervex re-used the figure of the medic in the later painting: the bushy-moustached man at the head of the dissection table in *Autopsie à l’Hôtel-Dieu* is also shown with his back to the viewer in *Avant l’opération*. This anonymous medic

²⁷⁹ Elizabeth Johns, *Thomas Eakins – The Heroism of Modern Life* (New York, 1983), p. 58.

²⁸⁰ Aubeau, p. 107 and Bianchon, pp. 317-318.

helps construct a medical scene in both paintings. Because he is shown as a modern medical worker rather than a doctor or medical student, the figure stands as a type rather than an actual person. Similarly, the patient and nurses in *Avant l'opération* serve as props rather than representations of known individuals. The objectification of these anonymous people helped reinforce the identities and characters of the identifiable men as modern medical professionals. The professional status of the men portrayed in the canvas was constructed by the objects that surround them, here represented not only by surgical tools and sponges, but also by the nurses, patient and medic. This differs greatly from Riegl's account of the seventeenth-century group portrait: "The Dutch group portrait is neither an expanded version of an individual portrait nor, so to speak, a mechanical collection of individual portraits in one picture: rather it is the representation of a free association of autonomous, independent individuals."²⁸¹ Gervex's portrait does not share Riegl's conceptualization of seventeenth-century Dutch group portraiture as democratic and equal because *Avant l'opération* does not consist of individual portraits of people who have volunteered to be portrayed to achieve a common goal. Rather, it revolves around the figure of Péan and the people that Péan chose to be represented and identified in his portrait.

Significantly, the portraits of Péan, Charcot and Pasteur that were on view in 1887 all displayed the identities of their protagonists through the representation of unknown people, particularly women. Despite the detailed rendering of their bodies, the patients painted by Gervex, Brouillet and Gsell are all symbolic types: hysterics, foreigners, nurses and mothers rather than identifiable individuals. In these paintings, the objectification of patients is essential to the construction of professional male identities, subjectivities and discoveries. Not only are Péan, Charcot and Pasteur's roles in modern science constructed as significant by these unnamed bodies, but their inventions are also symbolized by these same figures. As objects of medical study and experimentation, female and foreign patients became vehicles for the discoveries of these men. Péan's clamps, Pasteur's vaccines and Charcot's hypnosis were all performed on the bodies of the unknown. The spectacle of medical innovation was not only produced by the curative potential of modern scientific medicine but was guaranteed by these bodies.

²⁸¹ Riegl, p. 2.

Libidinal Looking:

The Artist/Doctor/Client and his Model/Patient/Prostitute

The spectacle of modern medicine was of interest to both men and women.²⁸² Both sexes read about medical feats in newspapers and magazines, saw the photographs, paintings and sculptures of medical men on display in Paris, and integrated hygiene and other medical practices into their daily routines. Although women were admitted to medical school in France from the late 1860s, they were predominantly in the hospital environment as nurses, nuns, or patients, and the active roles of diagnosis and analysis were considered solely male pursuits.²⁸³ In *Avant l'opération*, the female figures are represented as passive observers in contrast to the male figures who are shown as vigorously attuned to both Péan and his patient: the anaesthetised woman lies with her eyes closed and the nurse's face is turned away from the operation, looking at neither the doctor nor the naked female body. Although one could argue that the nun is facing the operation, her eyes are unfocused and lack the detail given to the other figures. Her access and proximity to the patient are restricted by the body of Péan's young assistant, Doctor Aubeau, and his outstretched arm. In contrast to the female figures, the male bodies are all engaged in the act of looking, thus implying that the canvas constructs a male viewing position: Monsieur Matieu, Doctor Larrivé and the medical attendant all twist and tilt their heads to get a better look while the older Doctor Colin focuses directly on Péan, and Doctor Zacharian fixes his gaze upon the patient's face. Although Doctor Brochin, the chief editor of the *Gazette des hôpitaux*, is barely visible, hidden from the viewer by Péan's imposing body and M. Matieu's leaning figure, Gervex nonetheless provided him with an eyeglass.²⁸⁴ Gervex also gave the implied viewer of the painting the ability to see. The viewer stands amongst these men, empowered with an active and privileged gaze. The life-size figures shown in the canvas contribute to the sense of an

²⁸² For a discussion of the relationship between women and popular medical culture see Mary Lynn Stewart, *For Health and Beauty: Physical Culture for French Women 1880-1930s* (Baltimore, 2001).

²⁸³ The American woman, Mary Corinna Putnam Jacobi, was the first woman admitted as a student to the Faculté de Médecine in Paris in 1867. Three other women, including the well-known English physician, Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, were admitted in 1868. For an account of the integration of women into the Parisian medical system, see Joy Harvey, "La Visite: Mary Putnam Jacobi and the Paris Medical Clinics" in Ann La Berge (ed), *French Medical Culture in the Nineteenth Century* (Amsterdam, 1994), pp. 350-371 and G. Despierres, "Histoire de l'accession de la femme aux études médicales et plus particulièrement à Lyon", *Conférence d'histoire de la médecine à Lyon* (Lyon, 1984), pp. 51-70, Pierre Darmon *Du médecin Parisien en 1900* (Paris, 1988), pp. 25-29, 211, and G. Nicole-Genty, M. Chapuis, J. Chapuis, et al., *Première femme médecin en France*, exh.cat. Bibliothèque de l'Académie nationale de médecine (Paris, 1976).

²⁸⁴ The names of the men depicted in the painting are taken from "*Avant l'opération*: Tableau de M. Gervex (Salon de 1887)", p. 76.

all-encompassing reality, and in turn, this demarcated space empowers the viewer with a position of authority from which to gain knowledge through the acute observation of the female body.²⁸⁵

Looking at naked bodies was understood as a reasonable and educational pursuit for medical professionals and artists. The examination of the undressed human body was a key component of both medical and artistic study. Émile Zola drew upon the social respectability given to artists and doctors for studying the body and sexuality in order to justify his detailed and intricate account of Parisian sex lives in his novel *Thérèse Raquin*, published in 1867.²⁸⁶ As a response to critics, who saw his realistic descriptions of bodies and sexuality as pornographic, Zola wrote in the preface to the second edition of *Thérèse Raquin* in 1868 that he was simply applying “to two living bodies the analytical method that surgeons apply to corpses.”²⁸⁷ He wrote:

While I was busy writing *Thérèse Raquin* I forgot the world and devoted myself to copying life exactly and meticulously, giving myself up entirely to precise analysis of the mechanism of the human being, and I assure you that the ferocious sexual relationship of Thérèse and Laurent meant nothing immoral to me, nothing calculated to provoke indulgence in evil passions. The human side of the models ceased to exist, just as it ceases to exist for the eye of the artist who has a naked woman sprawled in front of him but who is solely concerned with getting on to his canvas a true representation of her shape and coloration... Amid the concert of voices bawling: ‘The author of *Thérèse Raquin* is a hysterical wretch who revels in displays of pornography,’ I waited in vain for one voice to reply: ‘No, the writer is simply an analyst who may have become engrossed in human corruption, but who has done so as a surgeon might in an operating theatre.’²⁸⁸

By aligning himself with artists and surgeons, Zola’s rebuttal attempted to socially justify his descriptive prose, claiming that his desire to record every intimate detail of bodies and modern life was part of the shared practice of artists and doctors who probed all aspects of humanity, sexuality included. The attacks against Zola’s writing, which was described

²⁸⁵ Both men and women viewed the canvas at the Salon. There is no doubt that women were interested in medicine and also viewed nudes at the Salons. Nonetheless, the touching and looking at women’s naked bodies within the medical sphere was understood as a more male than female pursuit. For a discussion of male viewing within operating theatres see Marcia Pointon’s discussion of Eakin’s *Gross Clinic* and *The Agnew Clinic* in *Naked Authority: The Body in Western Painting 1830-1908* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 16-58 and Anthea Callen “Doubles and Desire: Anatomies of masculinity in the later nineteenth-century”, *Art History*, 26, 3, November 2003, pp. 669-699. For a pioneering work on the notion of a gendered gaze, see Laura Mulvey “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema”, *Screen*, 16, 3, Autumn 1975, pp. 6-18.

²⁸⁶ Zola’s story was first published in serial form in *L’Artiste* between August and October 1867 under the title *Une mariée d’amour*. The title was changed to *Thérèse Raquin* when the story came out in book form.

²⁸⁷ Zola, introduction to the second edition of *Thérèse Raquin* published in 1868, trans. Leonard Tancock, (London, 1962), p. 23.

²⁸⁸ Zola, p. 23.

by critics as realist and naturalist, reveal the ways in which realism, despite being associated with the language of science and reason, was also considered a style of scandal, gratuitous detail and pornography. Although Zola used the figures of the surgeon and artist to rid his work of its pornographic categorization, neither artist nor doctor were fully free from public criticism regarding the access their professions gave them to naked female bodies.

The relationship between artist and model, like that between doctor and patient, was understood as both professionally and sexually charged. Heather Dawkins, Susan Waller and Marie Lathers, as well as numerous other scholars of the nineteenth century, have discussed the sexual relationship between artists and their models.²⁸⁹ As they have pointed out, women posing naked in front of men as a form of employment was not only socially frowned upon, but many models were in need of more money than modelling could provide. Financial strain led some models into prostitution and therefore modelling was often equated with prostitution itself. Although the study of the female body was not institutionally justified by the Académie des beaux-arts, the relationship between naked model and artist within the artist's private studio was unregulated, thus further emphasizing the questionability of modelling as a proper profession. Like the relationship between artist and model, that between doctor and patient was also loaded with fear and fascination. The looking and touching of naked female bodies required by the medical profession wove threads of desire, immorality and distrust through public conceptions of modern medicine and its practitioners. Many nineteenth-century cartoons parodied the doctor and patient relationship. As is evident in an illustration from *L'Assiette au Beurre* from around 1905, in which a husband is shown exclaiming, "J'espère qu'il ne va pas me faire payer cette opération là!" while he watches a doctor embrace his wife, the seemingly acceptable access that medical men had to bourgeois wives, mothers and daughters was fraught with anxiety because medicine was also understood as being devoid of morals and any regard for faithful bourgeois relationships (Fig. 92). Furthermore, female patients were often considered highly sexed beings with deviant sexualities, as is most obvious in the case of hysteria. It was suggested that women seduced doctors in order to take pleasure in medical inspections, as some believed

²⁸⁹ For feminist discussions of the model's relationship to artists and authors, see Heather Dawkins, *The Nude in French Art and Culture, 1870-1919* (Cambridge, UK, 2002), pp. 86-133 and Marie Lathers *Bodies of Art: French Literary Realism and the Artist's Model* (Lincoln Nebraska, 2001). For a social history of models and how they were popularly understood, see Susan Waller *Invention of the Model: Artists and Models in Paris, 1830-1870* (Burlington, 2006).

that the use of the speculum awoke women's sexual desire.²⁹⁰ Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec implied that the sexual relationship between female patients and male doctors was consensual, as is shown in his 1894 advertisement for the upscale interior decorating stores, *L'Artisan Moderne* (Fig. 93). In this poster, a well-pruned woman is propped up on pillows in her bed, awaiting the arrival of a fashionably dressed young decorator. The man's smock, tool kit and predatory stance visually parodied and linked him to caricatures of lecherous medical men who, armed with professional apparatus, probed and penetrated the bodies of the bourgeoisie. The salacious nature of the implied and impending 'inspection' is symbolized by the woman's well-coiffed blond hair, by the shocked expression on the maid's face and by the small fluffy dog on the woman's lap, a well-known symbol of eroticism.

The belief that the relationship between doctors and female patients was sexually charged was emphasized by the greatly publicized connection between doctors and prostitutes that arose from discussions of the regulatory medical inspections of prostitutes.²⁹¹ The mandatory examination of prostitutes in France was established on Christmas Eve in 1810.²⁹² The inspections were instituted as a means to stop the spread of venereal diseases, particularly syphilis. The majority of the medical world, along with the French public, blamed prostitutes for spreading syphilis. As Doctor Fournier, a man who worked at Hôpital Saint-Louis with Péan, wrote:

Syphilis rebounds from the most abject hovel to the most honest home. The contamination of the virtuous spouse and the contamination of the child are often only the product of syphilis of the prostitute. Consequently, to pursue the syphilis of the prostitute is to protect *ipso facto* the virtuous woman and child.²⁹³

As is evident in Fournier's text, syphilis was often constructed as a sexual illness in which women were to blame. Fournier created a direct link between the prostitute and the wife and child, thus ridding men of responsibility. All prostitutes were required to register with the *polices des mœurs*. Significantly, brothel customers were exempt from inspection. Police demanded that all prostitutes be examined, though the logistics of the

²⁹⁰ Carole Groneman, "Nymphomania: The Historical Construction of Female Sexuality", Jennifer Terry and Jacqueline Urla (eds), *Deviant Bodies: Critical Perspectives on Difference in Science and Popular Culture* (Indiana, 1995), p. 233.

²⁹¹ For discussions of the medical inspection of prostitutes see Jill Harsin, *Policing Prostitution in Nineteenth-Century Paris* (New Jersey, 1985), Charles Bernheimer *Figures of Ill Repute* (Durham, 1997) pp. 8-33, Alain Corbin *Women for Hire* (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).

²⁹² Mary Spongberg, *Feminizing Venereal Disease: The Body of the Prostitute in Nineteenth-Century Medical Discourse* (Wiltshire, 1997), p. 36.

²⁹³ Fournier, "Prophylaxie Publique de la Syphilis" (Paris, 1887), as translated in Harsin, p. 60.

operation depended on the classification of prostitute. Women who lived in *maison closes* were inspected once every week or two at the *maison* while those who worked at *maisons de tolérance* or on the street went to a medical facility.²⁹⁴ The medical inspection consisted of a gynaecological examination with the use of a speculum, as well as an examination of the woman's hands, face, back, mouth, urethra and anus.²⁹⁵ A doctor and a police officer were always present, and, if in a *maison close*, the madam of the house. Although many prostitutes tried not to be registered on the police records, as it both posed a threat to their reputation and forced them to submit to what was considered an unpleasant and humiliating examination, most prostitutes held a *carte* on which their health was recorded. A prostitute who did not show up for the mandatory inspection or who did not have her *carte* was arrested and forced to submit to a gynaecological examination.

Although the medical inspection of prostitutes was understood as a matter of public health because syphilis was blamed for weakening national strength, poisoning families and decreasing the population, the relationship between doctors and prostitutes was often questioned. Félicien Rops represented this relationship in his print *Médecine Expérimentale* c. 1880, which shows a doctor having sex with a suspended pig (Fig. 94). Not only does this image construct the sexuality of medical men as deviant and perverse, but the pig, a symbolic representation of prostitution, also suggests that the medical profession's contact with prostitutes was a sexed one. Rops' image infers that the close contact of medical men with the bodies of prostitutes allowed experts to combine the libidinal delights of looking and touching naked female bodies with the authoritative power and social legitimacy of medicine. It was feared that under the guise of medical experimentation, doctors could satisfy their every desire.

Medical inspections of prostitutes blurred the boundaries between libidinal and professional looking. Although the purpose of medical examinations of prostitutes was to protect France from disease, doctors' access to prostitutes' bodies was considered similar to that held by brothel clients, thus further blurring the lines between professional and personal voyeurism. Representations of men examining prostitutes' bodies were popular in nineteenth-century visual culture, as many artists, most famously Edgar Degas, Edouard Manet and Toulouse-Lautrec, created numerous representations of prostitutes posing for customers. Prostitution was regarded as a modern subject matter *par*

²⁹⁴ Alain Corbin, *Women for Hire* (Cambridge, Mass., 1990), p. 87.

²⁹⁵ Harsin, p. 16.

excellence. Artists' representations of contemporary working women, particularly prostitutes but also milliners, laundresses and actresses, appeared to confirm the modernity of their pictures as well as their personal experience of Parisian life. These images also helped to construct and define the 'reality' of modernity as they were both products and producers of 'modern life'. Although the works by these artists differed greatly in size, style and composition, each made a claim to representing reality truthfully as their subjective and individual renditions of prostitutes' lives were presented and understood as proof of 'real' life experience.

As is evident in Jean-Louis Forain's *The client, or the brothel* and Constantin Guys' *Ces dames au salon*, fully clothed male clients were often represented looking at groups of barely-dressed prostitutes (Fig. 95, 96). The figure of the prostitute linked the libidinal gaze of the client with that of the doctor. This is particularly evident in Toulouse-Lautrec's paintings of prostitutes waiting for medical inspections, such as *Rue des Moulins* (c. 1894) (Fig. 97), *La femme aux cheveux blonds* (c. 1894) (Fig. 98), and *Deux femmes demi-nues au dos* (c. 1894) (Fig. 99). Toulouse-Lautrec created these works with thinned paint worked loosely on board. Brightly coloured semi-transparent paint strokes of contrasting hues were placed side by side to construct the tired bodies of prostitutes. In contrast to *Rue des Moulins*, the other two pictures appear more unfinished as the figures are painted directly on the board without a background setting or further contextualization. In comparison to Gervex's highly finished work, in which paint covers every surface of the canvas with minute brushstrokes, Toulouse-Lautrec's washed-in paintings look like rough watercolour sketches. His fluid strokes and his use of seemingly unprepared materials (cardboard and watery paints) create a sense of immediacy and directness that is not evoked by Gervex's oil painting. Gervex's work took hours of preparation: a canvas was stretched, oil paints were mixed to produce life-like colours, preparatory drawings were made to fit all the figures onto the picture plane, and time was needed to create the painting's licked-surface effect.

Rue des Moulins, the most detailed of Toulouse-Lautrec's works, depicts two semi-naked prostitutes standing in profile. They are shown in a line-up, which was the typical procedure during medical inspections as women were brought in to see the doctor in groups no larger than six.²⁹⁶ The prostitute with blond hair is shown holding up her pale pink chemise, revealing lumpy thighs and sagging black stockings. The other

²⁹⁶ Harsin, p. 16.

woman, whose fiery red pubic and head hair symbolize her status as a prostitute, is shown with a firmer bottom than her companion and her face is encrusted with red and pink paint. Unlike the images by Forain and Guys, a male viewer is not shown in Toulouse-Lautrec's painting. Nonetheless, as a picture that represents prostitutes on display within a brothel setting, it is likely that *Rue des Moulin* was painted with the expectation of a male spectator. The models/prostitutes were certainly scrutinized by the artist. The specific and detailed differences between the two women represented by Toulouse-Lautrec point to the artist's interest in the study and examination of female bodies. A photograph of the artist posing with a naked model in front of his 1894 painting *Salon de la rue des Moulins* (a work which contains a similar image of a prostitute in profile as does *Deux femmes demi-nues au dos*) stages the close relationship between the study of the unclothed female body and the creation of artworks (Fig. 100). Although the photograph of the model may appear to undermine the claims to reality made by the painting as it shows the painting was created in a studio rather than a brothel, the presence of the naked body also attests to the 'reality' of the artist's experience and contemplation of it. The photograph itself also served to document the event, suggesting that the painting alone was not enough to prove the reality of Toulouse-Lautrec's contact with naked women. Although there is no record that the artist's images of medical inspections were publicly exhibited, it has been suggested that many of his paintings of prostitutes were displayed in 1896 at a gallery off the *Rue du Forêt*. Anne Roquebert has found that at this exhibition, Toulouse-Lautrec displayed his paintings of brothel life in a separate room that was only frequented by men, thus implying that such images were created for the enjoyment of the artist and his male peers only.²⁹⁷

The implied viewer of *Rue des Moulins* can be understood as the artist, recording every intricate detail of the prostitutes' bodies, like a doctor, examining the bodies in order to provide or deny the women with a clean bill of health, or as a client, looking for a non-contagious body that would satisfy his needs. Yet the positions are never stable, as one identity merges into the other. The flexible spectator positions are further emphasized by the painting's setting. In *Rue des Moulins*, the brothel is simultaneously constructed as a bordello, a medical examination room and studio: it is simultaneously a place of pleasure, gynaecological examination and artistic creation. It is also the site of modern spectacle – medical, artistic and sexual – and a place where male eyes are

²⁹⁷ Anne Roquebert, "Rethinking Toulouse-Lautrec", in Richard Thomson, Claire Frèches-Thory, et al. *Toulouse-Lautrec*, exh. cat. Hayward Gallery (London, 1992), p. 36.

encouraged and expected to examine naked female bodies for personal and professional gain.

In contrast to the works by Forain and Guys, the viewer of Toulouse-Lautrec's painting is not given beautiful women to choose from. Rather, the women are constructed as specimens to be examined because they conform to nineteenth-century medical accounts of prostitution that described prostitutes as having sloped shoulders, low foreheads, red hair, large jaws and dirty skin. Although Toulouse-Lautrec's representations of prostitutes do not offer the licked-surface realism of Gervex's painting, his attention to medical descriptions of prostitutes imbues his work with a claim to reality associated with scientific study and acute visual observation. Despite the paintings' cartoon-like figures and bright colours, his works nonetheless make claims to truth. Unlike the pale smooth body of Péan's patient in *Avant l'opération*, the prostitutes in *Rue des Moulins* are similar to the representations of unhealthy women created in Parisian hospitals because they have the same discoloured and sickly surfaces as the syphilitic skin described by Doctor Henri Feulard, a doctor at Saint-Louis: "motley mixture of colour", "pigmented yellowish spots", "purplish spots", "plaques of a bright red colour, but lacking in definition of outline."²⁹⁸ Furthermore, Toulouse-Lautrec's prostitutes are visually similar to the representations of syphilitic female patients in the photographs emerging from Saint-Louis. As photography did not yet provide colour reproductions, colours were added to black and white photographs in order to create representations that appeared more life like. In the photographs published in Alfred Hardy and A. de Montméja's book *Clinique photographique de l'hôpital Saint-Louis* of 1868, the bodies of syphilitic women share similar poses and expressions as those portrayed by Toulouse-Lautrec. The sad faces and sloped shoulders of the woman photographed in profile, the bright red encrusted skin of another woman's head shot, and the photograph taken of a woman from behind appear as prototypes of Toulouse-Lautrec's paintings of prostitutes waiting for medical inspections (Fig.101, 102, 103).²⁹⁹ The photographs also look like mug shots, thus visually constructing female sexuality not only as diseased but as deviant and criminal.

²⁹⁸ J.J Pringle, Ernst Besnier, Alfred Fournier, et al., *A Pictorial Atlas of Skin Diseases and Syphilitic Affections: In Photo-Lithochromes from Models in the Museum of the Saint Louis Hospital, Paris* (London, 1895), pp. 26-28.

²⁹⁹ Although it is unknown whether or not Toulouse-Lautrec saw the representations of sick bodies on display at Saint-Louis, it is likely since he spent many days at Saint-Louis over the course of several years.

Representations of syphilitic women at Saint-Louis were not always shown as aging and horribly deformed. The photograph of “syphilide vesiculeuse” depicts a young naked woman, posing coyly with her arms behind her back (Fig. 104). Small red dots, added to the black and white photograph, decorate the curves of her body, running from her shoulder, down her breasts and around her abdomen until they disperse around her fuzzy pubis. The woman’s sexual allure, despite her diseased identity, is symbolized not only by her naked body but by the fashionable black ribbon that is tied around her neck. The ribbon corresponded to popular images of young working girls. It was an indicator of social position rather than a diagnostic sign. Medicine borrowed from popular visual culture in order to make its representations more readable and to help with diagnoses – they assigned particular diseases to specific bodies. This borrowing constructed certain diseases and bodies as sexually alluring despite their sick status. Significantly, the photographs produced at the hospital required interactions between photographers and doctors: doctors advised on what colours and details were required to produce life-like representations. Montméja and Hardy wanted to emphasize the connection between the photographic representation and the patient’s living body in order to attest to the truth claims of photography. This is evident in Hardy’s preface, where he wrote that, “nous pouvons dire que ses planches représentent la nature prise sur le fait...”, and by the text on the bottom of each photograph that states that the photograph and colouring were created directly from nature.³⁰⁰ Doctors ‘touched-up’ the photographs of naked female bodies to make them appear more real. Both the Saint-Louis photographs, and Lautrec’s paintings, required the intimate scrutiny of naked female bodies and professional male touch – medical or artistic. The movement from the visual (seeing the body) to the tactile (its visual recording by hand) points to a subjectivity that undermines the claims to objectivity made in medical discourse and implied by the belief in photography’s technological sincerity. Such a moment displays a libidinal involvement in the production of medical iconography whether the images were for medical teaching or art shows.

Toulouse-Lautrec constructed himself as artist/doctor in these images of prostitutes, as the works simultaneously represent his studying and recording of semi-clothed, diseased female bodies. Like the photographs taken for medical and anthropological study, Toulouse-Lautrec’s many drawings and paintings of prostitutes’

³⁰⁰ Alfred Louis Philippe Hardy and A. de Montméja *Clinique Photographique de l’hôpital Saint-Louis* (Paris, 1868), p. III.

daily lives – prostitutes cleaning themselves, playing cards, laying with lovers, eating – served as pseudo-scientific reports of late nineteenth-century brothel life (Fig. 105, 106, 107). They constituted a taxonomy of prostitution that he created and that others could buy and collect. Yet these ‘peep-hole’ pictures of prostitutes’ intimate and private moments also involved a voyeurism that was libidinally charged. Not only did they display Toulouse-Lautrec’s intimate knowledge of prostitution from his personal perspective as both artist and client, but they also served as pornographic images, offering representations of bodies and sexualities that would be considered obscene and perverse during the nineteenth century. Significantly, it has been suggested that after his death, his relatives destroyed many of these works as they were considered too pornographic. Like the large number of novels and medical texts that eroticized female patients, particularly hysterical women, Toulouse-Lautrec’s images are products and producers of nineteenth-century fears and fascinations with prostitutes, the ‘sickest’ women in French society.

Péan’s Spectacular Theatre: Competing Constructions of Reality

Dissection and operating theatres were sites of modern entertainment that staged medical procedures and practices for the public and medical community.³⁰¹ Doctor Péan, like other medical men in Paris, most famously Charcot, held weekly events in which he would perform surgery on up to six bodies over the course of a few hours in front of a large crowd.³⁰² The spectacle of the operation itself was further emphasised by Péan, who was known for yelling out to the crowd, “Ecartez-vous, messieurs, que tout le monde puisse voir!”³⁰³ Operating theatres encouraged the viewer’s participation in the performance of looking, thus constructing the viewer as both witness and participant in the spectacle of modern medicine. In a print depicting Péan lecturing to a crowd, the active gaze of the audience becomes the spectacle itself, while the body on which the assumed performance will take place is hidden and fragmented (Fig. 108). Only an extended leg is shown. The ability to take part in the pleasure of looking identified and differentiated the spectators from the bodies on display. The classification of bodies was based on visual scrutiny and the detection of difference. The operating theatre, as a site in which the healthy were differentiated from the sick by the former’s ability to see and

³⁰¹ Kemp and Wallace, p. 23.

³⁰² Horace Bianchon, pp. 316-317, and L. Marc, “Le Docteur Péan”, *L’illustration*, 31 December 1887, p. 480.

³⁰³ Bianchon, p. 316.

the latter's imposed blindness through anaesthetics and surgical restraint, was one of many places where the public's fascination with the classification and categorisation of bodies was staged.

Gervex's depiction of Péan's surgery differs significantly from the accounts of his contemporaries who offered competing constructions of reality. Horace Bianchon, doctor and medical biographer, described his experience of viewing Péan's surgery as follows:

Je fus émerveillé. Je n'avais pas idée d'une pareille dextérité, d'une telle rapidité, d'une sûreté de main si impeccable, d'une habileté si consommée. C'était plus étonnant qu'horrible, cette utile et bienfaisante boucherie, ce défilé de malades endormis, opérés, emportés en un clin d'oeil, se succédant sur la table sanglante parmi tout un hérissément clair de lames et de pinces, d'instruments inventés par lui.³⁰⁴

For Bianchon, the atmosphere is one of urgency, speed, blood and clanking metal. The operating theatre, like a torture chamber, is a site where the pleasure in looking at bodies being dissected and dismembered is encouraged and expected. Although Ollendorf, in his book on the 1887 Salon, praised Gervex's realistic representation of Péan at work, he also criticised its ability to mislead both contemporary and future viewers. Ollendorf wrote that:

Les personnages du fond ne font pas partie de la scène, et puisque M. Gervex a cherché la vérité, il aurait dû les supprimer. Quand un professeur enseigne dans nos salles d'hôpital, les élèves, attentifs, l'entourent, les infirmiers de service qui ont apporté la malade se retirent et l'on ne voit pas traîner sur le lit les courroies de leurs attelles. Enfin, puisqu'il s'agissait d'une oeuvre qui sera conservée, qui devra, suivant l'expression à la mode aujourd'hui, servir de document, nous aurions voulu que la patiente ait gardé le bonnet d'hôpital. Les cheveux en désordre, qui s'étalent sur le drap blanc, et qui mettent d'ailleurs si bien en valeur la chair lumineuse et saine de la malade, s'expliqueraient à la Salpêtrière à la suite de quelque attaque, de quelque convulsion nerveuse qui aurait échevelé tout d'un coup un sujet hystérique. Ici, à l'hôpital Saint-Louis, en présence d'une opération dont tous les détails vont être doctoralement et sagement expliqués, ils font faire fausse route au spectateur. Il faut dire encore que le groupement général est confus et qu'on explique mal...³⁰⁵

Ollendorf's comments reveal the instances in which Gervex departed from the realist quest of objective documentation in order to create an image that fulfilled his own desires as an artist, as well as those of Péan, as paying customer. Ollendorf recognized that Gervex utilized the iconography of hysteria in order to find the visual means to construct a female body that could retain its sexual allure despite its diseased identity. Visual

³⁰⁴ Bianchon, pp. 316-317.

³⁰⁵ Ollendorf, pp. 51-52.

representations of hysterical women in the popular press were predominantly highly sexed images, revealing a female body out of control and beyond societal norms.³⁰⁶ The hysterical body epitomized the potential danger and disease that was believed to exist in all female bodies, and therefore also symbolized a body in need of medical surveillance, documentation and control. Although sick female bodies were often associated with prostitution, female illness, including hysteria, was also considered fashionable and modern for the bourgeoisie. The desire to have a pale and sickly surface manifested itself commercially in women's cosmetics, particularly in the aptly titled white facial powder, *Poudre Ophélie*.³⁰⁷ Gervex's representation of a pale and sickly, yet young and attractive patient fits easily within the iconography of hysteria and images of fashionable female illness. Undressed, unconscious and horizontal, the woman in *Avant l'opération*, like Charcot's star hysteric Blanche Wittman in Brouillet's *Une Leçon Clinique* and the women photographed in the *Iconography Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, provided a pathological body for professional and personal viewing pleasure.

Toulouse-Lautrec's paintings and sketches of Péan also provide a different account of operating procedures at Saint-Louis. He studied Péan as he did prostitutes. By showing them washing, waiting and working, Toulouse-Lautrec's representations of both Péan and prostitutes are visible records of the actions and bodies of modern professionals in Paris. Like the previously discussed images of prostitutes, Toulouse-Lautrec's pictures of Péan are mostly rough drawings and thinly painted works on board. The artist frequented Péan's surgeries during the early 1890s because his cousin, Doctor Tapié de Celeyran, was one of Péan's interns. Tapié de Celeyran documented Toulouse-Lautrec's fascination with Péan's surgical theatre in *La Chronique Médicale* in 1922:

Intéressé par 'tout ce qui grouille', Lautrec ne fut pas long à me suivre à l'hôpital St-Louis, où la maestria de Péan eut tôt fait de le conquérir. Il y venait tous les samedis matin, couvrait de notes et de croquis des albums que je conserve jalousement, mettant en place les plans, divers et multiples, que comporte une intervention chirurgicale; après quoi, on allait se restaurer dans la gaîté de la salle de garde. En '92, la loi d'âge immuable fendit l'oreille à Péan, comme chirurgien des hôpitaux de Paris. En manière de vengeance élégante, le Maître fonda son Hôpital international, rue de la Santé. J'ai eu le bonheur d'y être interne pendant 4 ans.

³⁰⁶ For a discussion of the relationship between female sexuality and hysteria, see the third section of this thesis.

³⁰⁷ Bram Dijkstra, *Idols of Perversity: Fantasies of Feminine Evil in Fin-de-Siècle Culture* (Oxford, 1986), p. 46.

Lautrec suivit, comme il convenait, et pendant ce laps de temps, il employa toutes ses matinées du samedi à poursuivre ses recherches sur les gestes opératoires et la personnalité unique que fut Péan.³⁰⁸

As reported by Tapié de Celeyran, Toulouse-Lautrec recorded Péan's surgeries at both Saint-Louis and Hôpital Internationale over the course of several years. Although these sketches and paintings are now spread around the world, Dortu's *catalogue raisonné* of Toulouse-Lautrec's works contains roughly eighty of these sketches, including two oil paintings of Péan that are the most 'finished' of his representations of the surgeon.³⁰⁹ Unlike Gervex, who painted Péan with an erect posture and as perfectly groomed, the majority of Toulouse-Lautrec's images show Péan as a large and chunky man whose tiny head and feet do not appear to belong to his rotund body (Fig. 109). The artist's numerous sketches of Péan's face also provide various versions of the surgeon. Although some sketches provide elegant profiles of Péan as a grand orator and are similar to that by Gervex, others are rough caricatures that exaggerate Péan's hooked nose, heavy brow and voluminous facial hair (Fig. 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115). By recording the details of Péan's body, as is evident in the focused drawings of the surgeon's hands, face and feet, and by representing all aspects of Péan's procedures, including washing before surgery, addressing the audience, and operating on a body, Toulouse-Lautrec's images of Péan serve as historical documents as they provide the largest visual account of Péan's body and actions (Fig. 116, 117, 118, 119). Although his images lack the detail and intricacy of Gervex's painted portrait of Péan, they nonetheless stand as representations of reality: the number of images, the multiple vantage points and their status as sketches imply that they were created in the presence of Péan. Like Gervex, who referred to the act of sketching in his memoirs to indicate his direct experience of an event, Toulouse-Lautrec's sketches also construct the artist as witness. In contrast, *Avant l'opération* reproduces one event on canvas in a highly detailed and 'worked' way in order to produce an image that appears static and complete. Unlike Gervex's painting, Toulouse-Lautrec's representations of Péan can be understood as a body of work, the drawings working together to provide a composite account of Péan and his medical procedures. They imply a time-registered sequence of events as Péan is shown washing, then lecturing and then operating. Put together, the images could serve as a flipbook, symbolically bringing Péan

³⁰⁸ Gabriel Tapié de Celeyran, "H. de Toulouse-Lautrec et ses relations médicales", *La Chronique Médicale*, 1 December 1922, p. 357.

³⁰⁹ M.G. Dortu, *Toulouse-Lautrec*, volume V, (New York, 1974).

and his procedure to life through the quick turning of pages. Despite the differences in style and mediums, the instantaneity of Toulouse-Lautrec's studies produces a competing sense of the real that rivals that of the time-consuming photograph-like painted façade of Gervex's canvas. As Fried justly argues, photography may have been the dominant means of figuring the real but was not exclusively so.

Significantly, most discussions of Toulouse-Lautrec's medical images focus on how his desire to study and analyse bodies was similar to that of the medical profession.³¹⁰ Louis N. Baragnon described the artist's approach to depicting these medical scenes in his 1902 article "Toulouse-Lautrec chez Péan":

Face a une figure nouvelle, longtemps Lautrec la contemplait en silence. Son petit oeil la pénétrait comme une sonde. Ecartant les apparences, il allait droit à la réalité, à l'essence, au caractère. Ce regard aigu, pénétrant, presque obsédant pour le sujet, n'est-il pas celui de tous les princes du diagnostic?³¹¹

Baragnon used medical metaphors to emphasize Toulouse-Lautrec's investigative approach to art, thus constructing Toulouse-Lautrec as an artist/doctor. This dual position is further created by Baragnon who began his article with Toulouse-Lautrec's famous statement, "Si je n'étais peintre, je voudrais être médecin."³¹² Baragnon provided the same identity for Péan in the second part of his article that focuses on the doctor's consideration of a career in the fine arts. In his article "Comment on devient un grand chirurgien – Les aptitudes artistique de Péan", Baragnon quoted Péan as saying, "...je voulais être peintre ou médecin."³¹³ Henri Perruchot's 1958 book *La vie de Toulouse-Lautrec* creates further links between the professions of surgeon and artist. Like Zola's introduction to *Thérèse Raquin*, which links the analytic approaches of surgeon and artist, Perruchot drew connections between the surgeon's scalpel and the artist's brush, arguing that both professions required skilled hands and acute observation of bodies. Furthermore, he constructed the surgeon and the artist's relationship to bodies as rational and unsentimental. This is evident in his description of Toulouse-Lautrec's approach:

³¹⁰ For early accounts of Toulouse-Lautrec's encounter with Péan and the Parisian medical world, see Baragnon "Toulouse-Lautrec chez Péan", *Chronique Médicale*, 15 February 1902, Tapié de Celeyran, "H. de Toulouse-Lautrec et ses relations médicales", Maurice Joyant, *Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec* (Paris, 1926-27) p. 133, J. Natanson *Un Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec* (Geneva, 1951), pp.230-232, Pierre Vallery-Radot "La Médecine et les Médecins dans l'oeuvre de Toulouse-Lautrec" in *La Presse Médicale*, 14 July 1951, pp. 1021-1022. For more current accounts, see Richard Thomson *Toulouse-Lautrec* (London, 1977) p. 54 and Jean Sagne *Toulouse-Lautrec* (Paris, 1988), pp. 102-105.

³¹¹ Baragnon, "Toulouse-Lautrec chez Péan", p. 98.

³¹² The line is often quoted as stated above, or, as in Joyant, p. 132: "Si je n'étais peintre, je voudrais être médecin et chirurgien."

³¹³ Louis N. Baragnon, "Comment on devient un grand chirurgien. Les aptitudes artistique de Péan", *Chronique Médicale*, 15 February, 1902, p. 102.

Sa sensibilité se concentre, s'épanouit dans sa passion de l'analyse, qui trouve dans la rigueur chirurgicale une si évidente correspondance qu'il serait difficile qu'il ne s'en exaltât point. On ne fait pas de chirurgie avec des sentiments. Lautrec est tel devant la vie. Il n'approuve ni ne blâme. Il inventorie. Il se tient – spectateur – au delà des morales.³¹⁴

In Perruchot's text, the artist is constructed as an objective observer who, like a doctor, is understood as only being interested in the truth. Toulouse-Lautrec and Gervex were both described as analytic observers of modern life, and therefore their representations of Péan were both considered accurate representations of reality despite the different narratives, styles and mediums used in their work. Yet Gervex and Toulouse-Lautrec were not only linked to medical objectivity by the approach they took to the study of bodies. The two artists, as well as Péan and other medical professionals, shared an object of study: the prostitute. Gervex's rise to fame was created by the popularity of his 1878 painting, *Rolla*, a representation of an unclothed 'fallen' woman, which was rejected from the 1879 Salon because of its ostensible obscenity (Fig. 120). Péan's career was also linked to prostitution: working at a hospital that specialized in venereal and skin diseases, Péan's profession demanded close contact with prostitutes' bodies. And, as previously discussed, Toulouse-Lautrec's images of prostitutes comprise a large portion of his *oeuvre*.

Despite the numerous sketches, Toulouse-Lautrec only created two painted representations of Péan: *Une opération par le Docteur Péan à l'Hôpital Internationale* and *Une opération de trachéotomie* are both oil sketches on board made in 1891 (Fig. 121, 122). Like *Avant l'opération*, *Une opération par le Docteur Péan à l'Hôpital Internationale* represents Péan standing at the head of an operating table surrounded by known and recognizable doctors.³¹⁵ In both works, large open windows allow daylight to illuminate the operation. Although Péan is the main figure in *Avant l'opération* and in *Une opération par le Docteur Péan à l'Hôpital Internationale*, Toulouse-Lautrec constructed Péan's identity as a surgeon by the actions of Péan's profession, rather than through formal attire, a specific surgical tool and a red pin of the *légion d'honneur*, as did Gervex. In Toulouse-Lautrec's work, Péan is shown in the middle of a surgical procedure with his back to the viewer. The theatre is represented as a busy and chaotic space in which bodies crowd around an operating table to get a closer look while other

³¹⁴ Henri Parruchot, *La vie de Toulouse-Lautrec* (Paris, 1958), pp. 214-215.

³¹⁵ Amongst the nurses and interns represented are Doctors Delaunay and Baumgarten. For further information about the doctors rendered by Toulouse-Lautrec, see Gerstle Mack, *Toulouse-Lautrec* (New York, 1953), pp. 258, 234-235.

bodies wait to be cured. This painting has more in common with Bianchon's description of Péan's operating theatre than it does to the ordered and static portrayal by Gervex.

The spectacle of Gervex's representation of Péan's theatre is primarily created by the young, bare-breasted woman that dominates the canvas and the painting's narrative. In contrast, Toulouse-Lautrec constructed the spectacle of the operating theatre in *Une opération par le Docteur Péan à l'Hôpital International* through the representation of the clothed bodies that are involved in the operation and its related procedures: the men seated on chairs watching the event, the medic crouched on the floor next to a patient, the nurse standing at the ready, and Péan and his interns performing surgery are the source of the painting's drama. Patients do not occupy a prominent visual position in Toulouse-Lautrec's painting despite their central role in operating theatres. Although they are present, as is evident by the hidden body on which the operation is taking place and by the patient on the stretcher in the foreground, these figures are almost effaced as their bodies are concealed by the actions and bodies of medical professionals. The seated medic fragments and shields the body of the patient on the stretcher, and Péan's standing body, arms raised in action, disallows the spectator the viewing access to the patient on the operating table that is granted by Gervex. In Toulouse-Lautrec's work, Péan is placed in the position at the table that Gervex chose to leave free for the viewer of his canvas. Toulouse-Lautrec restricted the viewer's access to the patient, the operation and Péan.

In contrast, Toulouse-Lautrec's *Une opération de trachéotomie* provides an up-close representation of Péan in the midst of surgery. With a white napkin around his neck and a silver tool in hand, Péan is shown delving into the mouth of an unconscious patient like a hungry man cutting into his steak. Unlike *Avant l'opération*, which shows Péan gesturing elegantly, Toulouse-Lautrec's Péan is hunched over and is concentrating on the tracheotomy he is performing. Although the viewer is given full access to the patient and the operation, as is indicated not only by the open space provided but also by the figure of Tapié de Celeyran, whose tilted head and fleshy ear symbolically indicate the assumed position of the spectator, Toulouse-Lautrec did not lure the viewer into the painting through the representation of naked female flesh. The unconscious patient painted by the artist is dressed in a simple white shirt, a chloroform soaked cloth covers the eyes and nose, the skin is sagging, and the patient's sex is unspecified. Is this the body of an old man or a heavy-set aging female prostitute? The patient's crude features, drooping jaw

and thick neck rid the painting of sexual allure, thus securing the operation in the realm of the rational despite the rough and cartoon-like style of the work.

Realism beyond Reason: Sleeping Beauties

Contemporary critics located the sexual appeal of *Avant l'opération* in Gervex's painterly touch and in the painting's similarity to the artist's other works, such as *Rolla*, and *Femme au Masque*, which was exhibited at the 1886 Salon (Fig. 123).³¹⁶ Devillers wrote in his 1887 Salon review that:

Nul ne joue des blancs comme M. Gervex, mais comme il y mêle je ne saurais dire quelle substance aphrodisiaque qu'il n'est pas à dédaigner, qu'il nous réédite *Marion*, l'épouvante du jury, ou la *Femme au masque*. Il est bon d'appropriier son sujet à son mot. M. Gervex a de la polissonnerie sur sa palette, qu'il s'en serve.³¹⁷

Devillier's comments on the sexual and salacious nature of Gervex's painting practice are typical of the sexual metaphors used by many nineteenth-century artists and critics to describe the act of painting. In relation to *Avant l'opération*, Olivier Merson claimed that, "...on ne pourrait mieux peindre...le torse de la jeune malade, morceau accompli, caressé d'un pinceau sûr de lui..."³¹⁸ The seductiveness of Gervex's painting practice was also noted by A.-M de Bélinas in 1883 when he wrote that "Gervex n'est pas seulement un peintre de talent, mais c'est aussi un charmeur; comme son maître Cabanel, il possède cette distinction et ce langage séduisant qui attire."³¹⁹ Paul Mantz also focused on Gervex's representation of naked female flesh when he wrote in his 1887 review that the Salon crowd was drawn to the canvas "aussi bien par l'intérêt du motif que par certains détails d'exécution d'une très bonne venue, notamment les chairs de la femme, lumineuse et délicates sur les blancheurs du linge."³²⁰ In *Avant l'opération*, the aphrodisiacal lure of whiteness is enhanced as Gervex's white paint and naked female flesh become one. The touch of Gervex's painterly mark is emphasised by the touch of young Doctor Zacharian, whose pink hand wraps around the patient's pale wrist and whose heavy arm lies across her pelvis (Fig. 124). The neutrality of the clinic is potentially shattered in this moment of touch, where slipping sheets, gifted fingers, pink nipples and young flesh converge. The doctor's touch, like Gervex's stroke, invokes a

³¹⁶ For a discussion of why *Rolla* was removed from the Salon, see Hollis Clayson, *Painted Love: Prostitution in French Art of the Impressionist Era* (New Haven, 1991), pp. 79-93.

³¹⁷ Hippolyte Devillers, "Salon de Paris", *La Jeune Belgique*, VI, 7, 5 July 1887, p. 236.

³¹⁸ Olivier Merson, "Salon de 1887 - II", *Monde Illustré*, 14 Mai 1887, p. 315.

³¹⁹ de Bélinas, p. 52.

³²⁰ Mantz, n.p.

sense of desire that belies the assumed objectivity of rational documentation. Touch threatens to rupture the painting's realist surface as it exposes a bodily caress that exceeds the requirements of professional duty. Yet Gervex symbolically contained the sensuality evoked by the representation of a naked female body in close proximity to clothed men by painting knotted curtains, a leather restraining belt slung around the assistant's shoulder, and a claustrophobic crowd of standing bodies. Furthermore, he rendered the patient according to many nineteenth-century academic conventions of painting the female nude: it is painted with milky skin and closed eyes, a white cloth drapes the lower body, light falls on young breasts and dark hair cascades across crumpled sheets.³²¹ These elements reined in the possibility of passion and chaos, returning the scene to one of clinical calmness and control.

Academic nudes, such as those painted by Gervex's teacher Cabanel, spawned little criticism from the Salon jury: Cabanel's *Nymphe enlevée par une faune* (1860) and *La Naissance de Vénus* (1863) were both popular and celebrated Salon nudes during the mid-century (Fig. 125, 126). As clean, contained and 'sex-less' bodies in timeless settings created by smooth academic brushstrokes, these images were not considered pornographic or obscene because they were believed to embody abstract notions such as Beauty, Truth and the Ideal, or to refer to mythological or biblical tales.³²² They were not represented with pubic hair, fuzzy armpits or aging skin. Representations of unclothed bodies, particularly female bodies, were also used to symbolize nations, virtues and professions. Sculptures of female nudes, symbolizing Truth, Medicine and Nature, were scattered around the Académie de Médecine amongst the marble portrait busts of clothed medical mandarins. A bas-relief of classical male and female nudes sits above the entry way to the main building, nude female figures symbolizing Science and Truth flank the funerary sculpture of Doctor Brouardel in one of the courtyards, and Louis Ernest Barrias sculpture *Nature Unveiling Herself Before Science* of 1899 is positioned to the left of the

³²¹ Much attention has been given to the category of the female nude. For influential feminist accounts see Lynda Nead, *The Female Nude: Art, Obscenity and Sexuality* (London, 1992), Linda Nochlin, *Women, Art and Power* (London, 1989) and Susan R. Suleiman (ed), *The Female Body in Western Culture* (London, 1986).

³²² For a discussion of the censorship of the nude during the late nineteenth century, see Dawkins, pp. 7-85 and Jennifer L. Shaw, "The Figure of Venus: Rhetoric of the Ideal and the Salon of 1863", *Art History*, December 1991, 14, 4, pp. 540-570.

grand staircase leading to the medical library (Fig. 127, 128, 129).³²³ Female nudes were often used as metaphors of science, or to personify it. As Docteur G. Rappin wrote:

Il faut aimer la science comme on doit aimer une femme, c'est-à-dire pour ses qualités et l'idéal que l'on a placé en elle, et non pas pour la dot qu'elle porte. Hélas il en est à l'heure qu'il est de l'amour de la science comme de l'amour de la femme, c'est le profit, le gain qui seuls guident la plupart des hommes³²⁴

Representations of identifiable bodies were also mixed with symbolic figures. As is evident in Louis Edouard Fournier's 1896 portrait of Pasteur on display at the École normale supérieure, two women symbolizing Science and Humanity are shown behind the figure of Pasteur at work (Fig. 130). In this painting, the saving potential of Pasteur's labour is not only represented by the chemist in his laboratory but is symbolized by the female figure of Science, who is shown embracing a weak and limp Humanity. Represented as patient or muse, the identity and symbolic value of female figures in medical iconography and in medical buildings were determined by artists and the scientists who commissioned the works.

By being represented as a young bare-breasted woman with long flowing hair, the patient in *Avant l'opération* is also similar to the heroic female figures who personified France, such as Marianne, Liberté and La République.³²⁵ Although the patient's immobility contrasts with highly active representations of Liberté, as is evident in Delacroix's 1830 *La Liberté guidant le peuple* (Fig. 131), the patient in *Avant l'opération* can nonetheless be read symbolically as a sick Marianne. During the late nineteenth-century, Marianne was also constructed as weak and ill as a symbolic way to refer to France's loss in the Franco-Prussian war. The frailty and defeat of France was symbolized in an 1871 postcard that shows a bare-breasted and bound Marianne being spent to a Prussian camp (Fig. 132).³²⁶ By considering *Avant l'opération* in relation to these texts, it is possible that Gervex constructed the scene of Marianne's resuscitation: she can be brought back to life by Péan and his modern medical tools and technologies as she is transported from the battlefield to the operating table.

³²³ For a brief history of the acquisitions of the Paris Medical Faculty, see Louis Landouzy and Noé Legrand (eds), *Les Collections Artistiques de la Faculté de Médecine* (Paris, 1911).

³²⁴ Doctor Gustave Rappin, "Pensées" (c. 1895) as cited in Léonard, p. 240.

³²⁵ I am grateful to Sander Gilman for pointing out the prevalence of healthy and sick Marianne figures in nineteenth-century French art and literature.

³²⁶ For a detailed examination of the different significations of Marianne during the nineteenth century, see Maurice Agulhon, *Marianne into Battle: Republican Imagery and Symbolism in France 1789-1880* (Cambridge, 1981).

Although Gervex's depiction reveals an attempt to veil the model's nakedness by referring to other symbolic nudes and by drawing on academic conventions of painting the nude (her body is pale and smooth, complete and untainted, chaste and intact), it is apparent that this was intended to be read as a real, observed body, not an imagined one, as is evident by the patient's creased skin and rough hands. Realistic representations of unclothed female bodies were often considered obscene because unlike conventional nudes, these bodies exposed, or hinted at, a femininity that defied society's moral and sexual norms.³²⁷ As is evident by the ~~rejection~~^{removal} of *Rolla* from the Salon, and most famously by the ~~rejection~~^{reactions against} of Manet's *Olympia* ~~from~~^{at} the 1865 Salon, nudes were considered indecent when: body hair was shown; there was obvious evidence of undress; the woman represented was recognizable as a prostitute; the body was painted in a way that challenged the smooth, contained and 'sexless' body of conventional nudes; the body was associated with a scandalous contemporary setting or narrative (Fig. 133). Gervex's *Rolla*, which was based on Alfred de Musset's 1833 poem, shows the moment when a young bourgeois man looks onto the streets of Paris while considering suicide after having spent all his money on gambling and the lower-class prostitute lying in the bed. As Hollis Clayson argues, the painting alluded to the debauchery of modern Paris as the woman's discarded contemporary corset symbolized prostitution. This scene, and the corset in particular, modernized Gervex's nude; no longer veiled by the idealization and timelessness of academic nudes, the woman in *Rolla* was considered scandalous. Clayson suggests that the critics' dismay at this picture reflects nineteenth-century fears and anxieties surrounding female sexuality and the spread of sexually transmitted diseases. *Avant l'opération* also modernized the nude by its contemporary scene, yet its setting is one in which an unclothed female body is controlled and made healthy through the medical intervention of male hands. In contrast, the woman in *Rolla* stretches out on a bed, carefree and unselfconscious. It is *Rolla* himself who is being punished for his sins, not the naked woman.

Significantly, Gervex's professional identity was based upon this representation of an undressed woman. The young prostitute, Marion, stripped naked on a bed in *Rolla*, brought the young Gervex fame and artistic credibility within the circle of artists defined by Zola as naturalists and exemplified by artists such as Manet and Courbet. The

³²⁷ For a discussion of how realism was often equated with dirt and ill morals, see Alan Krell, "Dirt and Desire: Troubled Waters in Realist Practice", Richard Hobbs (ed), *Impressions of French Modernity* (Manchester, 1998), pp. 135-147.

painting's rejection from the Salon helped construct Gervex as the new *enfant terrible*. In 1881, Zola praised Gervex and named him as one of the younger generation of artists who would follow in the footsteps of Courbet and Manet. He wrote: "...des révoltés de l'École des beaux-arts, Gervex, Bastien-Lepage, Butin, Duez, sont passés dans le camp des modernes et semblent vouloir se mettre à la tête du mouvement."³²⁸ Gervex's ascribed identity as a realist painter, constructed by his celebrity as the creator of *Rolla*, suggests that his representations of undressed female figures were considered shocking and lascivious as his name itself signalled the display of alarmingly sexualized modern women. Yet, as is evident by the women represented in *Avant l'opération* and *Femme au masque*, Gervex's rendering of undressed women hovered between nineteenth-century notions of acceptance and scandal. As is evident by Henry Houssay's 1886 Salon review, by the mid-1880s Gervex's representations of undressed women were considered pleasant rather than notorious. Gervex's realism was considered as alluring and pleasurable as it was rational and objective. Houssay wrote that, "...si la *Femme au masque* de M. Henri Gervex est du naturalisme c'est assurément du naturalisme tout à fait aimable et plein de séduction."³²⁹ This shift in Gervex's practice, and critics' responses to his representations of unclothed female bodies, reflects the flexibility and un-fixedness of terms such as realism and naturalism, particularly during the later part of the nineteenth century. This instability is further evident by Houssay questioning whether Gervex's work was in fact naturalist. Such comments point to the changes taking place in relation to both critics' and artists' views of the category of the nude in French painting.

By the late 1880s, the modern nude was not as contested a category as it had been during the 1860s and 1870s, when paintings such as Manet's *Olympia* and Gervex's *Rolla* caused great uproar. Most recent art historical investigations of the nineteenth-century nude tend to focus on those from the 1860s and Gervex's 1878 *Rolla*. When later nudes are examined, they are generally considered rooted in 1860s and 1870s' debates. The historical shift in attitude towards the genre of the nude is most evident by the 1889 campaign to buy *Olympia* for the national museum as well as the Caillebotte bequest of

³²⁸ Émile Zola, "Après une promenade au Salon", *Le Figaro*, 23 May 1881. Zola also praised Gervex's naturalism in *La naturalisme au Salon 1880* and *Lettres de Paris: Nouvelles artistiques et littéraires – Le Salon de 1879*.

³²⁹ Henry Houssay, *Le Salon de 1886* (Paris, 1886), p. 6.

1884.³³⁰ The decline of traditional academic nudes at the Salon was noted by Zola in 1881, when he wrote that:

Chaque année, je constate que les femmes nues, les Vénus, les Eves et les Aurores, tout le bric-à-brac de l'histoire et de la mythologie, les sujets classiques de tous genres, deviennent plus rares, paraissent se fonder, pour faire place à des tableaux de la vie contemporaines...³³¹

Although nudes in contemporary settings were relatively commonplace by 1887, representations of unclothed female bodies nonetheless produced both pleasure and anxiety as women were simultaneously constructed as innocent, pure, sickly and seductive. The constructed duality of the female body remained because of the essential uncertainty and unknowability of the female sex. Despite intrusive examinations, scientific experimentation and hours spent being photographed, hypnotized and drugged, the 'secrets' of the female body were never considered solved. As is evident by its frequent personification as Nature and Truth, the female body was understood as an object from which knowledge could be gained, and therefore direct observation and constant surveillance were deemed necessary and socially justified. Louis Ernest Barrias' sculpture *Nature Unveiling Herself Before Science* illustrates such a construction. As Ludmilla Jordanova argues, the sculpture implies that science is a masculine viewer who can achieve full knowledge of nature through the examination of a female body.³³² She points out that what is significant about Barrias' work is that the female body is not a naked body, exposing all, but is rather a body that needs to be unveiled. To disrobe the female body would provide pleasure through the act of revealing, yet it would also indicate that there is something to conceal.

In *Avant l'opération*, the female body is never completely unveiled nor is it ever fully stripped of academic conventions. The gap in the creased sheet which covers her lower half exposes pink flesh and creates a delicate opening that appears pure and clean yet penetrable. The sheet's literal ability to hide the female body is simultaneously used to mask and draw attention to the female genitals. As Peter Brooks argues in his psychoanalytic examination of the representation of female bodies in nineteenth-century French realist paintings and novels, the unveiling of the female body is impossible because narratives that involve this unveiling "sooner or later reach the problem of

³³⁰ For various discussions of the Caillebotte bequest, see Jeanne Laurent, Pierre Vaiss, Jacques Chardeau et al., "The New Caillebotte Affair", *October*, 31, winter 1984, pp. 69-90.

³³¹ Zola, "Après une promenade au Salon", *Le Figaro*, 23 Mai 1881.

³³² Ludmilla Jordanova, *Sexual Visions: Images of Gender in Science and Medicine between the Eighteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Hertfordshire, 1989), p.87.

unveiling the female sex, which they find to be itself a veil – perhaps from the anxiety that its final unveiling would reveal there is nothing to unveil, or rather, that apparent nothing is indeed something.”³³³ To ‘de-nude’ the patient in *Avant l’opération* would ultimately lead toward the unveiling of the female sex, considered in psychoanalytic theory to be the locus of male anxiety and female power. ‘De-nuding’ the patient completely would also have led to its refusal from the Salon. Although Brooks claims that this inability reflects the realist artist’s inability to leave the conventional nude behind, it also points to the female body as a site of realism’s irrationality and subjectivity.

Gervex’s reliance on artistic conventions of painting the female nude allowed him to create a scene in which the sexual gratification of viewing the naked female body was untainted by medical constructions of femininity that primarily focused on the female body as diseased, disobedient, fertile and fragile.³³⁴ Yet, the aestheticization of the female body belies the illness that the medical theme suggests, and ultimately exposes the trouble with realist claims to objective documentation. Unlike earlier paintings of nudes by Gervex, such as *Satyre jouant avec une bacchante* of 1874 and *Baigneuse endormie* of 1873, this naked body can no longer be unproblematically consumed as the playful body of a young nymph in the woods or as a sleeping nude in an idealised landscape (Fig. 134, 135). Rather, this is a representation of a modern female body, a medicalized *parisienne*, a clinical Ophelia. Removed from a mythological setting and represented in a medical sphere, this female body is transformed into an object of scientific inquiry. Unlike the contained vessels of academic femininity, where the robust health of female figures is indicated through their intimate connection with nature, the medical setting in *Avant l’opération* constructs the female body as a body to be read and monitored.³³⁵ Gervex’s rendering of the patient’s smooth, young body disavows the signs of illness that her position on the operating table purports. Furthermore, the body’s idealisation contrasts the attempted realism of the patient’s face, whose large nose and furrowed brow indicate

³³³ Peter Brooks, *Body Work: Objects of Desire in Modern Narrative* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1993), p.159.

³³⁴ The strength of female bodies was also noted in medical discourse, as doctors were studying why women were living longer than men. For a critique of how feminist accounts may over emphasize the nineteenth-century construction of women as being weak and closer to nature, see Ludmilla Jordanova, “Linda Nochlin’s ‘Women, Art and Power’” in Norman Bryson, Michael Ann Holly and Keith Moxey (eds), *Visual Theory: Painting and Interpretation* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 54-60.

³³⁵ For an interesting account of the relationship between painting a realistic nude and the medical inspection of women, see Richard Thomson’s discussion of Charles Maurin painting shown at the 1887 Salon des Indépendants. Thomson, *The Troubled Republic: Visual Culture and Social Debate in France 1889-1900* (New Haven, 2004), pp. 38- 42.

that this is a representation of a modern woman rather than an idealised classical beauty. The representation of Woman in *Avant l'opération* fluctuates between sickness and health, purity and contamination, idealism and realism, thus exposing the fragility and impossibility of a perfect and static femininity.

Gervex's adherence to the conventions of painting a female nude reveals a further attempt to mask the identity of the patient. Although the painting's title and Péan's presence indicate that this woman must be a patient at Saint-Louis, and is therefore a lower-class woman and a likely victim of sexually transmitted disease, nowhere is this illness obviously indicated on her body. Unlike the prostitutes/patients painted by Toulouse-Lautrec, or the frenzied women photographed at the Salpêtrière, her body is smooth and white, contained and solid. It is devoid of nature's flaws and the signs of living. Unlike patients at Saint-Louis, whose bodies were scarred with open sores and rashes, this smooth body looks like an anatomical wax model, a medical Venus. Medical Venuses, which were used as teaching models to instruct medical students on how to visually locate illness and disease on female bodies, stood in stark contrast to the realities of lived-in female bodies – bodies that bled and hosted disease, bodies that were contagious, bodies that died and rotted.

Wax models were used as teaching aids because wax, more than any other medium during the nineteenth century, was believed to best resemble human flesh. As published in the popular scientific journal, *La Nature* from 1894, "La seule matière plastique capable de rendre absolument l'effet des chairs, leur velouté et leur transparence, est la cire."³³⁶ Although there were wax representations of male bodies, most life-size models were female, and were created as figures that, like jigsaw puzzles, could be taken apart and put back together again. The most famous of these were the medical Venuses created by Clemente Susini and Gaetano Giulio Zumbo for the Specola in Florence during the eighteenth century (Fig. 136, 137). The popularity of these models in France is evident in Gaston Le Breton's 1891 "Essai Historique sur la Sculpture en Cire", in which he provided a full history of wax models from early Egyptian figures to nineteenth-century medical *moulages*.³³⁷ The public fascination with wax models was sustained by Pierre Spitzner's display of pathological and celebrity wax bodies in his

³³⁶ Alber, "Les Personnages en Cire," *La Nature*, 21, 1 (1894), p. 325.

³³⁷ Gaston Le Breton, "Essai Historique sur la Sculpture en Cire", *Précis Analytique des Travaux de l'Académie des Sciences, Belles-Lettres et Arts de Rouen Pendant l'année 1891-1892* (Paris, 1893), pp. 250-303.

Grand Museum Anatomie, which opened to the Parisian public in 1856 (Fig. 138). The spectacle of medicine was further propagated by Spitzner, who hired doctors and nurses to lead the visitors through the exhibitions.³³⁸ The popular demand for such entertainment provoked the opening of six to eight similar displays in Paris in the second half of the century, including the Musée Grévin which opened on the Boulevard Montmartre in 1882.³³⁹ Vanessa R. Schwartz writes that the public's fascination with waxes was linked to the nineteenth-century obsession with representations of real bodies. By referring to a cartoon from 1882, in which two working-class men look at a wax figure of a dead body and discuss its close resemblance to corpses at the morgue (the morgue was also considered a site of entertainment as it was open to the Parisian public), Schwartz argues that the pleasure and entertainment provided by the viewing of wax figures arose from their striking verisimilitude to real bodies (Fig. 139). As reported in the *Moniteur Universel*, "at the Musée Grévin resemblance is perfect, striking, extraordinary. You begin to ask yourself whether you are in the presence of a real person."³⁴⁰

During the nineteenth century, medical *moulages* became a primary form of recording diseases because they could provide more realistic representations than real living bodies: sealed in jars, human flesh discoloured and disintegrated while wax maintained its applied form and pigments. Wax modelling, like photography, was introduced into the Parisian hospital system as a means of recording the intricacies of diseases and diseased bodies.³⁴¹ A *moulage* was created by a plaster cast that, moulded on the human body, provided a negative into which wax could be poured.³⁴² Following the moulding process, the *mouleur* and doctor would work together to create an object that was not only understood as an exact replica of the human body, but was also readable. As is evident by nineteenth-century wax Venuses, clothing, hair, and jewellery

³³⁸ Pamela Pilbeam, *Madame Tussaud and the History of Waxworks* (London, 2003), p. 136.

³³⁹ *Le corps en morceaux*, Musée d'Orsay (Paris, 1990), pp. 53-54 and Pamela Pilbeam, p. 149.

³⁴⁰ *Moniteur Universel*, 6 June 1882 as cited in Vanessa R. Schwartz *Spectacular Realities: Early Mass Culture in Fin-de-Siècle Paris* (Berkeley, 1998), p. 119. Schwartz also points out that wax museums added many elements of the real to contribute to the verisimilitude of wax figures such as accessories, ornaments and framing effects. The sense of reality was further created as scenes from recent history or realist novels were created with wax models, thus drawing connections between the claims to truth of journalism and realist aesthetics in wax. See pp. 89-148 for her discussion of waxworks.

³⁴¹ For an examination of medical wax models in France see Thomas Schnalke, *Diseases in Wax: The History of the Medical Moulage*, translated by Kathy Spatschek (Germany, 1995), pp. 83-92, and Hélène Pinet, "Cire anatomique" in *Le corps en morceau*, pp. 51-56.

³⁴² For a description of how *moulages* were made see Schnalke p. 9, Gérard Tilles, "Histoire des bibliothèques médicales et des musées des hôpitaux de l'Assistance publique. L'exemple de l'hôpital Saint-Louis", PhD thesis, Université de Paris XII (Paris, 1995), and Édouard Papet, "Technique: 'saisir la nature sur le fait'" in Édouard Papet, Stephen Freeke, et al., *À fleur de peau: Le moulage sur nature au XIXe siècle*, exh, cat, Musée d'Orsay (Paris, 2001), pp. 74-77.

were often added in order to aid the viewer in determining who the patient was and what illness was present (Fig. 140, 141). *Moulages*, as imprints of the body's surface, provided the easiest visual access to a disease, and allowed doctors to test their own knowledge of diseases and their symptoms without the presence of the patient. The examination of the *moulage*, unlike the examination of a living human body, particularly the body of a woman, was not regulated by the confines of proper bourgeois comportment and spectatorship. Rather, these wax bodies, contained within the privileged and regulated medical sphere, allowed, stimulated and encouraged the visual scrutiny of naked bodies and body parts.

The female body in *Avant l'opération*, like a medical Venus, is an idealised yet pathological body, prepared to be dismantled and observed by the skilled eyes and hands of medical professionals. In contrast to Péan, whose masculinity is symbolized by his erect posture, gesturing hands, formal attire, facial hair and prominent position in both the painting's composition and narrative, the patient's femininity is symbolised by nudity, pallor, and passivity. The woman's comatose state becomes representative of a femininity that allows for the total empowerment of the male gaze and touch. In turn, the sleeping woman acts as a foil against which male agency can be asserted. The female body has no agency: she is pure body, pure material, ready to be manipulated, prodded and penetrated. Be it by Péan's scalpel or Gervex's brush, the female body becomes both the object of male performance and its source of knowledge. Like a medical Venus, this female body contains the promise of revealing all. It is a potential body in pieces that could be taken apart and reassembled by Péan's skilled hands. Jonathan Sawday writes in his examination of Renaissance medicine that the fragmentation of the human body becomes necessary for the acquisition of medical knowledge as the violent reduction of the complete body into pieces forms a new 'body' of medical understanding.³⁴³ In these wax figures, the female body becomes the object that improves medical knowledge and whose purpose is the advancement of medical learning. These wax representations of women embodied nineteenth-century medical constructions of femininity and the female body: it was simultaneously a body that was sick and in need of fixing as well as innocent and pure. It was a body that did not resist surgical experimentation. Wax, unlike human flesh, is a material that can be easily cut into without encountering bones or organs. It can be melted and moulded to hide any signs of trauma. By drawing on artistic

³⁴³ Jonathan Sawday, *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture* (London, 1996), p. 2.

conventions, as is evident in the fashionable pallor of female skin, the loose flowing hair and the figure's state of rest, these waxes provided a palatable femininity that passively revealed all.

The connection between wax and a submissive and pathological femininity was also made by Rachilde in her scandalous novel, *Monsieur Vénus*, published in 1884. In this text, Raoule de Vénérande, an aristocratic woman, cunningly seduces a beautiful, young working-class painter, Jacques Silvert, through a series of actions that reversed conventional nineteenth-century gender roles. Raoule is an active seductress: she dresses as a man, financially supports Jacques and controls his actions. Throughout the novel, Jacques becomes increasingly 'feminized' by Raoule: he obeys her commands, he wears the delicate and luxurious clothing that she gives him, and in the bedroom he takes on the traditional female role of passive and coy receiver. Diana Holmes argues that by having Raoule subject Jacques to the objectification, violence and humiliation usually inflicted upon women, Rachilde was able to reverse and parody conventional nineteenth-century conceptions of gender, and therefore reconfigure gender identity as fluid.³⁴⁴ The ultimate objectification and 'feminization' of Jacques occurs at the end of the novel, when Raoule creates a wax model out of Jacques' dead body. By adding Jacques' blond eyelashes, white teeth and fingernails to the model, thus making the wax appear as life-like as possible, Raoule creates her own *monsieur Vénus*. Wax, like women, were considered soft, subtle and malleable, and therefore the transformation of Jacques from a living man into a pliable model served to rid him of the active and domineering characteristics and traits understood to belong to the male sex. Furthermore, Jacques' transformation into wax transgressed conventional gender roles and stereotypes because medical Venuses were primarily representations of female bodies made for male viewers. Raoule's *monsieur Vénus* not only acts as an effigy from which she can remember her lover, but it is also an instrument of sexual pleasure. Once again subverting gender roles, the novel ends with Raoule, here conceived as both a young woman in mourning and a young man in evening dress, visiting the wax model:

They come to kneel beside the bed, and after contemplating at length the marvellous lines of the wax statue, they embrace it, kiss it on the lips. A spring hidden inside the flanks connects with the mouth and animates it at the same time that it spreads apart the thighs.³⁴⁵

³⁴⁴ Diana Holmes, *Rachilde: Decadence, Gender and the Woman Writer* (Oxford, 2001), p. 120.

³⁴⁵ Rachilde, *Monsieur Vénus*, translated Melanie Hawthorne (New York, 2004), p. 210.

Jacques is not only 'feminized' by the new material of his body but his sexual actions are mechanically made female as his legs are made to separate upon sexual arousal. As is evident by this text, death, sex and femininity are intricately bound in the figure of the wax Venus, who remains sexually available despite her (or in this case, his) life-less, life-like body.

Representations of sleeping, anaesthetised, hypnotised, and dead women were prominent in nineteenth-century culture. Bram Dijkstra claims that these representations of passive femininity that made no overt erotic demands upon the male viewer were popular because they symbolised a femininity that appeared untouched by the emerging feminist movement.³⁴⁶ Elisabeth Bronfen, in her psychoanalytic examination of the aestheticization of death in Gabriel von Max's 1869 painting *Der Anatom*, states that the female body can materialize into an immaculate aesthetic form because it is a dead body, transformed into Art (Fig. 142). She argues that representations of dead female figures expose how death functions in the aesthetic construction of beauty, as beauty becomes contingent on the transformation of an animate body into an inanimate one. While representations of unconscious female figures may signify beauty, completeness and perfection, they also anticipate the dissolution of such attributes.³⁴⁷ In *Der Anatom*, the fear of death is masked by the idealisation of a female corpse. Following similar conventions, Gervex hid the pain and suffering of Péan's patient by painting a semi-idealised nude body. In both works, the aestheticization of the inanimate female body stands in for the unstable, fragile and ultimately unachievable representation of unknowable states.

In *Avant l'opération*, Gervex was confronted with the problem of how to represent the unrepresentable condition of the body under anaesthetics realistically. Although anaesthetics were first used in 1846, it was still unknown quite how they worked.³⁴⁸ Although anaesthesia was praised because it allowed for longer operations and removed all visible signs of pain during surgery, some contemporary critics commented that such a process was brutal and violent, and therefore propagated the use of hypnotism during surgery instead.³⁴⁹ At the Salpêtrière, anaesthesia was a common

³⁴⁶ Dijkstra, p.35.

³⁴⁷ Elisabeth Bronfen, *Over Her Dead Body: Death, Femininity and the Aesthetic* (Manchester, 1992), p.5.

³⁴⁸ For basic overviews of the rise of anesthetics see Bynum, pp. 121-123 and Roy Porter *Blood and Guts* (London, 2002), pp. 123-124.

³⁴⁹ Dr Azam, *Hypnotisme Double Conscience et Altération de la Personnalité* (Paris, 1887), pp. 31-33.

form of punishment and control used on hysterical women.³⁵⁰ In *Avant l'opération*, Gervex depicted the moment of the controversial act of making the subject unconscious, presenting the viewer with a passive and peaceful female body. The only harmful signs of anaesthetic are the traces of blood on the white cloth and the patient's slightly furrowed brow. The woman is represented in the constant state of being put to sleep as her consciousness is controlled by the young doctor holding the chloroformed cloth. Although aesthetics were celebrated by the medical community because surgeons could perform operations more swiftly without the interference of a struggling patient, the public feared surgeons' full power over anesthetized bodies. Martin S. Pernick argues that the link between anaesthetics and power was often seen in terms of sexual dominance. As is evident in Victorian humour magazines, where images showing women being tamed by anaesthetics became popular, anaesthesia was closely linked to male power and female passivity.³⁵¹ The ties between sexual desire and the application of anaesthetics are pictorially represented in *Avant l'opération* by the hands of the young doctor: one hand lingers near a nipple while the other stays ready to cover her mouth.

Most contemporary critics recognised and labelled the woman depicted as an *anesthésie* or as *chloroformée*.³⁵² Gervex's representation of an anaesthetised woman shared many similarities with the wax model of an anaesthetic at the Musée Orfila, which opened in Paris in 1847.³⁵³ Both bodies were represented with long flowing hair, pale skin and smooth surfaces. Notably, Gervex painted the patient's lips slightly parted to indicate that this was a living and breathing body despite its inanimate status. The fascination with a body living on the cusp of life and death was also evident at the Orfila, where a wax Venus' mechanical lungs stimulated the act of breathing. The electricity that coursed through the wax at the Orfila and the modern chemical substance that surged through Gervex's anaesthetised patient both imbued these nudes with the blood of modernity. As Nina Auerbach argues in her examination of the constructed duality of Woman during the nineteenth century, the timelessness of myth and the contemporaneity of technology unite in representations of sleeping female bodies as they represent the embodiment of Woman whose slumbering surface contains the power of her age.³⁵⁴

³⁵⁰ Elisabeth Bronfen, *The Knotted Subject: Hysteria and its Discontents* (New Jersey, 1998), p. 196.

³⁵¹ Martin S. Pernick, *A Calculus of Suffering: Pain, Professionalism and Anesthesia in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York, 1985), p. 86.

³⁵² M. Roux, front page; Mantz, n.p; Meurville, "Le Salon – La Nature au Salon", *Gazette de France*, 27 May 1887, XII.

³⁵³ I have been able to photograph this model or find a picture of it.

³⁵⁴ Nina Auerbach, *Woman and the Demon: The Life of a Victorian Myth* (Boston, 1982), pp.41-42.

The state of anaesthesia, a state between life and death, the animate and the inanimate, found its ideal medium in wax. In 1919, Freud used E. Jentsch's example of waxwork figures as the source which most keenly aroused the distinct sense of the uncanny. Freud described the uncanny as arising out of the feeling of "doubt as to whether an apparently animate object really is alive and conversely, whether a lifeless object might not perhaps be animate."³⁵⁵ The sense of the uncanny was believed to be produced by the hyperrealism of wax models. Freud's familiarity with wax figures is evident not only by the wide-spread popularity of wax museums as forms of entertainment during the late nineteenth century, but also by his years as a student in Paris during the late 1880s. As Doctor Charcot's student at the Salpêtrière between 1885 and 1886, it is likely that Freud was familiar with the wax models at the Salpêtrière and in other Parisian hospitals. Although wax was able to provide the realism that science demanded, it provoked feelings of fear because the medium maintained social and historical connections with cruelty. The inability to distinguish reality from fiction when viewing waxworks provided entertainment as much as it provoked anxiety, as is evident by de Bury's tale in *Les Bonhomme de Cire*. For de Bury, the realism associated with wax models was connected to madness, fear and repulsion rather than reason and delight. Wax often stood in when the human body fragmented or died, as is evident in wax death masks, religious effigies, and the wax heads of those killed under the guillotine on show at Madame Tussaud's and Musée Grévin. Norman Bryson claims that waxwork figures are most real in their excessive detailing but that they are never real enough. He argues that the displeasure of viewing wax models is caused by the inability of wax, as a medium, to maintain the desired stability of idealization and bodily wholeness despite the realism of its surface. Beneath the wax figure's life-like skin lurks the sense of the body in pieces and the ego in fragments, as wax melts and crumbles, thus presaging a body in pain, mutilation and potential termination.³⁵⁶ Like medical Venuses, the anaesthetised state lingers between the interplay of idealisation and abjection, the wholeness of the body's exterior veiling the instability and unknowability of its interior.

³⁵⁵ Sigmund Freud, *The Uncanny* trans. David McLintock (London, 2003), p. 135. This description is the one that Freud borrowed from E. Jentsch.

³⁵⁶ My discussing on waxworks draws on Norman Bryson, "Everything we look at is a kind of Troy" in Tracey Bashkoff and Nancy Spector (eds), *Sugimoto Portraits*, exh.cat. Guggenheim (New York, 2000), p. 61. It is also informed by Naomi Schor's discussion of wax models in "Duane Hanson: Truth in Sculpture" in *Reading in Detail*, pp. 131-140.

In *Avant l'opération*, Gervex attempted to create an image in which the promise of female flesh remained safely contained through the use of artistic conventions. Gervex constructed a voyeuristic scene in which the gaze could enjoy the spectacle of modern medicine, specifically its main object of inquiry, the female body, without having to turn away from the brutality which lurks behind the scene's ultimate narrative: that of an operation in which a female patient will be cut open and will bleed. Rather than paint this bloody event, Gervex depicted the moment before the operation, the moment of cleanliness, hygiene and control, the moment before the surgeon's clean hands and white shirt would be stained with the woman's blood, and the moment before the rational erect bodies of suited medical men would be transformed into hunched-over butchers. The tiny drops of blood are an intimation of what is to come. They also work pictorially to bring out the artist's blood red signature. The red paint used to create Gervex's name foreshadows Péan's impending cut, thus connecting the manual and specialized skills of both artist and surgeon. Bronfen points out that such representations epitomise the "crucial moment of hesitation" where the aesthetically pleasing unity of the female body appears to draw "added power from the fact that implicitly we know it is about to be cut into."³⁵⁷ Péan was a man who cut and cured bodies. In *Avant l'opération*, he is presented, tool in hand, ready to puncture the immaculate vessel as the female body becomes the site of his performance. The perfect contours and whiteness of female flesh are ready to be destroyed. The female body as it is now represented will never be the same again but will be scarred and marked by the surgeon's cut. Unlike other paintings of surgical theatres, like Eakin's *The Gross Clinic*, that show bodies mid-surgery – bloodied and fragmented – the whole and unpunctured body on the operating table in *Avant l'opération* does not repel the viewer because it is not yet disfigured (Fig. 143).³⁵⁸

Péan, as a surgeon, fragmented and fixed bodies. His profession demanded the repetitive act of cutting and sealing. Péan's invention was used to seal arteries, yet the mark of his knife left his seal in human flesh. Such bloody displays were not suitable for a Salon audience, nor could such a representation present Péan as a perfect icon of republican masculinity. The painting required an idealised representation of a pure and contained femininity yet the painting's narrative, sitter, and scene demanded a body in pieces. Despite the safety of aesthetic conventions and the assumed reason and logic of

³⁵⁷ Bronfen (1992), p. 5.

³⁵⁸ Fried claims that the wounded figure in *The Gross Clinic* simultaneously invokes pleasure and pain. He points out that the violence of surgery is morally justified in the image because it is a picture of curing and because the anesthetized state infers that the patient is not feeling any pain. See Fried (1987), p. 61.

realism, the painting remains haunted by the inevitability of incision. Restricted by societal constraints, Péan's interest in the cutting and curing of diseased bodies could not be fully realised within the confines of painted portraiture. It is not surprising, therefore, that Péan turned to another form of realism that, through its association with the production of medical knowledge, was also cloaked by social respectability.

Péan's collection of wax body parts

During the last decades of the century, Péan privately commissioned roughly 500 *moulages* of diseased body-parts. These waxes were displayed in the large lecture theatre at Saint-Louis, which was purpose built in 1889 to host the first international conference of dermatology and to celebrate the progress of French medicine during the *Exposition Universelle* of that year (Fig. 144).³⁵⁹ Each wax shows with great detail how specific diseases attack particular parts of the body: wax models of tongues, arms, faces, torsos and genitalia are covered with signs of illness as is evident by the representation of pus and multicoloured rashes which cover the objects' surfaces (Fig. 145, 146). The depiction of fleshy skin tones, the redness of infection, minute hair follicles and goose bumps produced representations of sick bodies that were considered as life-like as possible. These wax body fragments were mounted on black painted wood and framed by white plaster-soaked cloth. They were accompanied by a printed label that showed the name of the doctor who commissioned the piece, the name of the disease, and another printed label provided the wax's catalogue number. Significantly, each black board containing a wax body part was signed in white paint by the creator of the *moulage*.

By drawing on such artistic conventions as the practice of signing an artwork, the *moulages* were aligned with the seemingly more subjective and elitist world of Art. The personally marked works and aestheticized presentation undermined the waxes' status as purely objective models made for scientific study, and located them as part of a privileged and personal collection. Although collecting was considered integral to the production of medical knowledge, it also reflected the subjective fantasies of the collector. As Jean Baudrillard argues in his examination of collecting practices, any given object has two functions: how it can be utilized and how it can be possessed. He claims that once an object is no longer tied to its function, its meaning is solely dependant

³⁵⁹ Gérard Tilles and Daniel Wallach, *Le Musée des moulages de l'hôpital Saint-Louis*, (Paris, 1996), p. 14.

upon the subject (collector).³⁶⁰ The waxes were tied to Péan and to the ‘reality’ that he wished them to represent. Like Péan, the *mouleur* at Saint-Louis had an invested role in the production of the waxes, as is most evident by his signature which sits in close contact to the doctor’s name. Although this united the model-maker with the doctor, symbolically imbuing him with a medical professional’s claim to accuracy and objectivity, it was ultimately the doctor’s experience and orders that were needed for the construction of the ‘reality’ of a disease.

Jules Baretta, the *mouleur* who made the majority of waxes at Saint-Louis during the nineteenth century, began his process by making a plaster cast of the diseased body part. The process of making a *moulage* involved intimate touching and looking at naked bodies, as is evident in Édouard Joseph Dantan’s painting *Un moulage sur nature* (shown at the 1887 Salon) and Felicien Rops’s *La naissance de Vénus* of 1878 (Fig. 147, 148). In Dantan’s work, men are peeling dried and heavy plaster off a woman’s naked body, while in Rops’ work a sculptor pours liquid plaster onto a woman’s bare stomach and genital region. Both images show healthy female bodies as the object of casting; the casts produced would later be used as models of idealized female bodies for artists. As is evident by the close contact between naked female bodies and clothed men in these works, the touching of stripped women elicits a sense of desire despite the veneer of professional obligation. This tension, and the wish to keep touch reigned in as a specialist’s task, is evident in Paul Mantz’s 1887 Salon review of Dantan’s painting:

Les deux artistes qui se livrent à cette besogne y apportent une sorte de gravité sacerdotale; il ne laissent point distraire par le spectacle voisin; si l’on confiait de pareils aveux à de purs laïques, on verrait peut-être leur main s’afiter au contact de la chair amoureuse; mais il y a pour les mouleurs des grâces d’état, et ils ne s’intéressent qu’au succès de leur opération délicate.³⁶¹

Despite Mantz’ belief that the *mouleurs* were indifferent to bare female skin, the painting’s narrative used the professional guise of casting as a socially justifiable means to display the contact between naked female flesh and rough male hands. Although Dantan created a modern nude by showing the female model in a contemporary setting, with a Parisian *coiffure*, brassy gold bracelet and tanned face and hands, this representation nonetheless adheres to many academic conventions of painting an idealized female nude: her body is white, her pubic mound hairless and her nipples are

³⁶⁰ Jean Baudrillard, “The System of Collecting,” trans. Roger Cardinal, John Elsner and Roger Cardinal (eds), *The Cultures of Collecting*, (London, 1994), p. 7.

³⁶¹ Mantz, n.p.

pink and erect. By drawing on these tropes, Dantan, like Gervex, constructed female sexuality as pure, accessible and unthreatening for its display at the Salon. By surrounding the model with professional men in their specialized work place, Dantan constructed artists' practice (including his own) as professional and detached, while the act of looking and touching naked bodies is shown as a valid requisite for the creation of female nudes.

The casting process in the medical sphere required the same intimate and lengthy contact with bodies as it did in the art world. As M. Sully Prud'homme wrote in 1891, the intimate process of making a medical cast at Saint-Louis required patience and kindness:

M. Baretta est un précieux collaborateur de la science. Sans brutalité, avec des douceurs de mère et une patience qui ne se dément pas, il applique ses appareils et pendant que la matière prend, il cause avec le malade, s'intéresse à son affection, se fait raconter ses évolutions, gagne, sans la chercher, sa confiance tant il inspire de sympathie. Le malade aime-t-il mieux se taire, comme il faut un certain temps pour que l'appareil durcisse et que la vue d'une pièce en préparation n'a rien de réjouissant, M. Baretta lui montre ses tableaux... puis il se met au piano et le voilà qui berce son client avec quelque vieille mélodie.³⁶²

Although Sully Prud'homme's account constructs Baretta as compassionate and caring by describing his kindness towards patients at Saint-Louis, the wax tongues and genitalia displayed at the hospital show that casting was an invasive and uncomfortable process as it demanded that wet plaster be applied to open sores, rashy skin and the body's most sensitive openings. The exhaustive touching of female bodies is particularly evident in Péan's collection of *moulages* of diseased female genitalia. In many of his waxes, fingers are shown prying open vaginal lips in order to reveal interior illness (Fig. 149). The thickness, length and position of the fingers, cast from life along with the genitalia, beg the question 'to whom do the fingers belong?' Although they may allude to masturbatory pleasure, itself conceived of as a sign of female deviance and illness in nineteenth-century medical discourse, by being cut off from the body, the fingers also act as a medical tool, such as the speculum, holding open female cavities for medical male eyes. The function of the fingers and their fragmentation from an identifiable body helped rid the wax models of the salaciousness invoked by their close iconographic ties with pornographic images, which showed probing fingers as a means of representing pleasure and exposing further flesh. The wax casts also stood as proof of medical touch itself, as they held in wax the intimate moment of bodily contact between doctor/*mouleur* and his

³⁶² M. Sully Prud'homme, "Préface", L. Roger-Milès *La cité de misère* (Paris, 1891) pp. 160-165.

patient/model. The scrutiny and handling of diseased genitalia also points to a pleasure that was not necessarily libidinally charged. The gratification of studying the minute and intricate detailing of diseases, as well as the pleasure taken in cataloguing and collecting *moulages* of diseased body parts, indicates a curiosity and delight in representations of reality that exceeded medical and taxonomic requirements. Yet displayed in a medical setting and labelled *ad nauseam* with the names of doctors, diseases and catalogue numbers, the fingering of female genitalia was constructed as a legitimate professional pursuit.

Created primarily as objects of study, waxes were examined by medical students and other doctors as a way to practice diagnostic skills and see rare diseases. As is evident by Sully Prud'homme's text, patients also had limited access to the waxes in order to see what was happening, and was going to happen, to their bodies. As learning tools and models of illness, the realism of the waxes was thought to be of utmost importance. The three dimensionality of the medical *moulages* contributed to the realism of the objects, as they were believed to provide more life-like models than those created by other media used in medical instruction, such as photography, painting, drawing and print.³⁶³ Nineteenth-century viewers believed wax objects could provide the most realistic representations of the human body. An article in *Annales de dermatologie et de syphiligraphie* described the waxes in 1889: "ces modèles sont de pures reproductions, la nature prise sur le fait..."³⁶⁴ Yet *moulages* were expensive to commission, very time consuming to create and only allowed small fragments of bodies to be represented. As recorded in the *Courrier des médecins de Saint-Louis au Directeur de l'Assistance publique* in 1896:

Le moulage, réservé pour les cas les plus rares, ne peut reproduire qu'une petite partie des lésions (...) la confection des moulages, par leur prix de revient et le long travail qu'ils nécessitent ne peuvent se faire qu'en nombre restreint.³⁶⁵

For this reason, photography was increasingly integrated into the hospital system as the primary means of recording diseases. Although photography was first used at Saint-Louis by Doctor Montméja during the late 1860s, the production of photographs overtook that of waxes during the 1890s when a photography studio was installed at the hospital.

³⁶³ Multiple visual sources were used as teaching aids at Saint-Louis throughout the nineteenth century. For a discussion of teaching models at Saint-Louis and other at Parisian hospitals, see Tilles (1995).

³⁶⁴ "Lettres de Paris par P.G Unna" in *Annales de dermatologie et de syphiligraphie*, IX, (Paris, 1889), p. 59.

³⁶⁵ *Courrier des médecins de Saint-Louis au Directeur de l'Assistance publique*, June 1896 as cited in Tilles (1995), p. 140.

Significantly, photographs were taken not only of patients but also of the wax models as is evident in the atlas of skin diseases produced by the Saint-Louis doctors which contains coloured photo-lithographs of wax models as well as black and white photographs of living patients (Fig. 150). These photographs show how wax models of bodies, photographs of patients and actual human beings were used interchangeably in the teaching of medicine. *Moulages* were understood to provide as realistic a recording of diseases as living bodies. At times, they were considered more desirable. Through the intervention of artists and the input of doctors, the colours and shapes of diseases could be made more obvious in the media of photography and wax. Although photographs could fray at the edges and wax models could crumble, neither decomposed nor rotted, as did the human body. The signs and symptoms of diseases could be frozen in time in both print and wax, unlike the human body and its illnesses, which were organic, ever-changing and contagious. Such instances expose moments in which real bodies failed to fulfil the realist demands of modern medicine. The uncontrollable human body could not always provide a stable, consistent or realistic enough model for medical study.

Medical waxes also stood as trophies of medical conquests. As new illnesses were 'discovered', many medical men and scientists named diseases after themselves, thus propagating their status as medical innovators. The naming of tools after specific doctors, such as Péan's forceps and homeostatic clamps, also helped display professional rank. Péan's name was exhibited next to each wax along with his diagnosis, and his name was printed in large letters above his collection at Saint-Louis. The expense of creating *moulages* also exhibited the new economic status of medical men. Péan's waxes displayed the financial success he achieved by being a surgeon, showed his personal involvement in medical study and also displayed his professional commitment to French medicine. By the mid-century, French doctors were encouraged to start their own collections of medical objects, tools, sculptures and paintings in Parisian hospitals. As is evident by the list of the benefactors of the Académie de médecine on display in the main building of the Académie near the library, medical men provided the funding for the opening of medical museums and the creation of new medical specialities (Fig. 151). The emergence of medical museums in France was brought about as a means to compete against other nations, particularly Prussia and England, whose medical collections were well known.³⁶⁶ It was believed that medical museums not only strengthened medical

³⁶⁶ For a discussion of the emergence of medical museums in France, see Tilles (1995), pp. 216-225.

knowledge but also exhibited the superiority of a country's medical progress internationally, thus serving to attract foreign doctors and students. Parisian doctors constructed France as a significant medical force by hosting the first international congress of dermatology at Saint-Louis in the large lecture theatre that was filled with *moulages*. Through the exhibition of these waxes in a newly completed building, French medicine was presented as modern, rich and progressive to an international crowd. Significantly, Péan's collection was fully visible to the visitor who stood in the main lecture theatre while some other doctors' collections were displayed behind walls, thus affirming Péan's key role in the collection of *moulages* at Saint-Louis and his essential role in the documentation and discovery of diseases. Significantly, Péan's collection was the largest belonging to any one doctor at the hospital.

Although waxes were signifiers of the progress and wealth of French medicine during the late nineteenth century, they were historically linked to aristocratic collecting practices. During the eighteenth-century, Gaetano Zumbo created many wax models for the cabinets of curiosities of wealthy people in France, as did Honoré Fragonard, a surgeon, anatomist and cousin of the painter Jean Honoré Fragonard, and André Pierre Pinson, who was a surgeon and the personal doctor to Louis XVI and the conservator of the Duke d'Orléans *cabinet des cires* at the Palais Royale.³⁶⁷ Philippe Curtius, who had trained as an anatomist, also created a collection of wax figures of famous people, such as Voltaire, Rousseau, Necker and Mesmer, which were displayed in France until the beginning of the French Revolution. The waxes in these collections were on display to the privileged few who approached the objects with a desire for both knowledge and pleasure. The waxes were simultaneously understood as educational tools, aesthetic specimens and bizarre curiosities. After the French Revolution, the waxes were removed from private collections and given to the State, thus altering their status from elite objects of pleasure and curiosity for the aristocracy to democratic, nationally owned objects that could educate the public.³⁶⁸ Significantly, many figures from Curtius' collection, such as Necker and the duc d'Orléans, were taken on 12 July, 1789 by revolutionaries and carried around Paris covered in black crepe as a form of revolutionary propaganda.³⁶⁹ Although

³⁶⁷ For an account of the history of waxes in France see Pilbeam, pp. 37-63, Schwartz p. 92 and Tilles (1995), pp. 217-219.

³⁶⁸ Nonetheless, there were still some republicans who were against the use of waxes as a form of mass entertainment as they believed that the realism of the waxes could fool the public into believing that the constructed wax scenes were unquestionably truthful representations of historical events.

³⁶⁹ With the onset of the Revolution, Curtius was quick to sever ties with the court and became a revolutionary. Schwartz, p.95.

the majority of medical wax models were exhibited in the medical realm during the nineteenth-century, the status of waxes as curiosities remained, as is evident by the commercial success of the Spitzner museum which also displayed medical models to the public. Mixing the spectacular with the educational, the Spitzner museum had a special section dedicated to wax models of body parts ravaged by syphilis in order to entertain the public and exhibit the ills of alcoholism and promiscuity. This example shows how *moulages* of diseased body parts, particularly those which represented genitalia and sexually transmitted diseases, straddled the border between entertainment and education. In order to secure the waxes' use as educational tools, medical models, such as Péan's, were displayed as scientifically as possible. In 1883, Doctor Doyon wrote that without a proper scientific museum for the display of anatomical models, medical waxes would be objects of curiosity rather than instruction.³⁷⁰ In comparison to the lavish velvets and decorative cabinets of curiosities of the eighteenth century, the simple wood cabinets with black back-drops at Saint-Louis constructed the waxes as rational objects of medical study rather than spectacular objects displayed to satisfy bizarre curiosities. Displayed in a room specifically created for the exhibition of medical models, every *moulage* at the hospital was labelled, catalogued and displayed behind glass in an attempt to rid them of voyeuristic delight.

Although Péan performed numerous surgeries, he was best known as a doctor who specialised in operations on female reproductive organs.³⁷¹ Hirschler's contemporary account of Péan in *Nos Docteurs* wrote that, "C'est à l'hôpital Saint-Louis qu'il s'est surtout fait connaître par d'admirables opérations d'ovariotomie qui l'ont placé tout à fait au premier rang des grands chirurgiens...Le docteur Péan est certainement à l'heure qu'il est le plus célèbre opérateur connu."³⁷² Péan was the first to perform a vaginal hysterectomy in France, designed medical tools specifically for operations on women's bodies and he also publicised his charitable operations on female, not male, patients.³⁷³ Not surprisingly, *moulages* of diseased and distorted female genitalia

³⁷⁰ Doyon, A. "Du mode d'enseignement de la dermato-vénérologie contemporaine. Vienne, Paris, Lyon", *Annales de Dermatologie et de Syphiligraphie*, 1883, 4, pp. 189-196, 249-256, 309-311, as cited by Tilles (1995), p. 106.

³⁷¹ Ovariectomies became a common surgical procedure during the late-nineteenth century. It was even suggested that the removal of ovaries, like the removal of appendices, was a means in which surgeons could make money as it was not always a necessary medical procedure. See *La France Médicale au XIXe Siècle*, p. 229.

³⁷² Hirschler, p. 126.

³⁷³ Dr Delaunay, "Péan jugé par ses élèves", *Chronique Médicale*, 15 February 1898, p. 104, and Aubeau, p. 106.

comprise a large portion of Péan's collection. Row upon row of wax representations of diseased genitalia were, and still are, hung behind glass under a sign that lets the visitor know that these wax body parts belonged to the famous surgeon (Fig. 152). Like Courbet's *L'Origine du Monde*, these representations of female genitalia were commissioned by, and produced for, a specific and privileged male gaze (Fig. 153).³⁷⁴ Although it was claimed that the waxes were made directly from nature, indicating that they were cast directly from a human body and finished with the utmost realism in the presence of that body, the waxes' details reveal the phantasmatic side of realist fantasies. For instance, Doctor Fournier's wax female genitalia, exhibited across the room from Péan's, were covered in fluffs of pubic hair and coloured with bright tangerine-pink pigment while Péan's collection remained relatively hairless and flesh-toned (Fig. 154). Significantly, the process of detailing the wax model was one that united the *mouleur* with the medical professional, as it was here the medical man directed the *mouleur* on how much colour was needed, how much intricate detailing was required, and how much hair to insert. This moment allowed a medical man, such as Péan, to become both surgeon and sculptor, and perhaps even pornographer. These representational differences show the individual preferences of doctors, particularly how they wished to construct the 'reality' of female sexuality. Despite the objects' uses and display within the seemingly objective medical sphere, the personal and subjective tastes of collectors remained on show.

Conclusion: "Éffroyable réalisme"

Péan's professional identity as a rational man of modern scientific medicine imbued him with the social qualifications to both produce and authenticate reality. His commission, *Avant l'opération*, required the representation of an idealised femininity for its display at the Salon while his commissioned pieces for the walls of Saint-Louis demanded that female sexuality be represented as degenerate, diseased, and dismembered. Péan's wax genitalia represent an erosion of the perfect femininity that Gervex attempted to construct. Péan's identity as a reasonable republican in *Avant l'opération* stood in opposition to the identity invoked by the wax fragments. As is

³⁷⁴ Courbet's painting was commissioned by Khalil Bey, an art collector and the Turkish ambassador to St Petersburg, for his own collection of erotica in 1866. For a history of the painting, see Linda Nochlin, "Courbet's 'L'origine du monde': The Origin without an Original", *October*, 37, Summer 1996, pp. 76-86.

evident in Roger-Milès book *La Cité de misère* from 1890, these medical waxes represented:

...toute l'armée des dermatoses, dans leur représentation exacte, dans leur crudité exceptionnelle, dans leur effroyable réalisme; le laid, le monstrueux, le douloureux (...) ces debris humains figurés, collectionnés à l'hôpital même, sont comme des souvenirs où revivent de traîtresses infections.³⁷⁵

The frightening and horrifying realism of Péan's waxes contrasted with Gervex's work, which was considered a rational painting that provided pleasure through the representation of a bare-breasted young woman. Unlike Gervex's representation of a relatively flawless female body, the waxworks expose Péan's intimate contact with disease, contagion, and female genitalia. The number of waxes commissioned and the intricate detailing of every fleshy fold, deformity and pustule reveal a fascination with the female body, female sexuality and representations of reality that goes beyond the demands of professional scientific duty and into the realm of fantasy and desire. Unlike *Avant l'opération*, in which the unharmed surface of the female nude helped portray Péan as a man of utmost control and rationality, the diseased wax fragments constructed a collector and collecting practice that bordered on obsession.

Wax, in the nineteenth century, was considered a medium of realism and reason, yet was also regarded as the material of fantasy and spectacle as is evident by the popularity of exhibition venues like the Musée Grévin and the Spitzner anatomical museum. Wax's smooth surface could best represent the body's exterior as solid and complete while its mimetic properties produced an indexical mould of every physical imperfection, thus seeming to reproduce a body with painstaking realism, and without the mediation of materials like paint which displayed an artist's touch. Yet it was a substance that prioritised bodily contact, and in turn became the product and evidence of this intimate encounter. Furthermore, the life-likeness of the waxes also provoked feelings of horror, fear, and fascination rather than simply rationality and reason.

Avant l'opération was understood as a form of realist documentation. The painting was the end product of the interactions between a republican surgeon and a realist artist, a paying customer and a portrait painter. Gervex's use of realist techniques constructed both himself and Péan as modern, rational men. Yet Gervex's realism failed to mask the irrational desire that was signalled by the effigy of a naked female body on display. Similarly, the personally invested and highly charged waxes could not remain

³⁷⁵ L. Roger-Milès, *La Cité de Misère* (Paris, 1890), pp. 156-157.

hidden behind the detached façade of modern scientific medicine. Neither Péan's representations of female bodies in wax or Gervex's in paint could guarantee a purely objective, accurate and stable recording of reality or femininity. Surely such a desire itself reveals a madness because of its obvious impossibility. Péan's collection of sick female figures in paint and in wax both expose the vulnerability, instability and unfeasibility of the claims to truth and the real made by realistic representations. The creating and collecting of representations of female bodies always threatened to erode the rational façade of modern scientific medicine and professional duty as fantasy and pleasure were never far from the surface. Both *Avant l'opération* and the wax genitalia reveal a desire, obsession, and fascination with the female body, particularly for Monsieur le Docteur Jules Emile Péan: creator and collector of realistic representations of bodies and body parts.

Hysterical Realisms: Representing Reality at the Salpêtrière

André Brouillet's painting *Une leçon clinique à la Salpêtrière* represents a crowd of men from various disciplines – medicine, politics, art and literature – in the process of recording the intricate movements of a hypnotized female hysteric while listening to the illuminating words of the renowned neurologist, Doctor Jean-Martin Charcot (Fig. 7).³⁷⁶ Declared “le succès du Salon” by Hugues le Roux in *Le Temps*³⁷⁷ and “une des oeuvres les plus importantes du Salon” by *Le journal des arts*³⁷⁸, *Une leçon clinique* was discussed and reproduced in multiple journals and Salon catalogues during the late nineteenth century. L de Fourcaud claimed it was Brouillet's most important painting to date³⁷⁹, Olivier Merson asserted that it was a masterpiece that characterized the times, prophesizing that it “pourrait bien être la toile à sensation du Salon de 1887,”³⁸⁰ and both Meurville and Mantz referred to the crowds that formed around the painting from the first day of its display.³⁸¹ That both Brouillet and his painting were to become fashionable is not surprising, considering that he chose to paint a work that combined numerous interrelated themes designed to capture the popular imagination: hysteria, hypnosis, the illustrious Charcot and the internal workings of the Salpêtrière and its female patients. Guy de Maupassant's novel *Le Horla*, published in *Gil Blas* in October 1886, whetted the public appetite for tales of hypnosis and hysteria while Jules Claretie's novel *Les amours d'un interne* published in 1881 exposed the fragility of medical mores as young interns at the Salpêtrière succumbed to the sexual lures of hysterical women.³⁸² The drastic rise in diagnosed cases of hysteria during the second half of the century, from one percent in 1841 to seventeen percent by 1883, as well as the proliferation of pictures, plays, novels and medical texts about hysteria, encouraged and sustained the public's fascination with this mystifying disease and the women it was believed to inhabit. Viewed by the Parisian

³⁷⁶ Charcot taught at the Salpêtrière, a hospital in Paris that specialized in the study and treatment of the mentally ill. For a history of the Salpêtrière and its impact on French culture and society, see Mark S. Micale, “The Salpêtrière in the Age of Charcot: An institutional Perspective on Medical History in the late nineteenth century”, *Journal of Contemporary History*, 20, 4, October 1985, pp. 703-731.

³⁷⁷ le Roux, n.p.

³⁷⁸ “Le Salon”, *Le journal des arts*, 3 June, 1887, p. 2.

³⁷⁹ de Fourcaud (1887), p. 325.

³⁸⁰ Merson, p. 282.

³⁸¹ Meurville, “Le Salon – La Nature au Salon”, *Gazette de France*, 27 Mai, 1887, p. XII, and Mantz, n.p.

³⁸² Guy de Maupassant's *Horla* was published in book form in 1887.

public at the annual Salon, Brouillet's large canvas and life-size figures invited all viewers into the modern medical world of Charcot's Salpêtrière, giving them a front row seat in what was otherwise a sold-out show.³⁸³

Une leçon clinique is a product of hysteria's heyday, when the Salpêtrière was a "musée pathologique vivante", when its photographic studio and artistic atelier pumped out images, when its doctors produced visual recordings and its patients obediently performed.³⁸⁴ Drawings, etchings, photographs, paintings and wax and plaster casts of hysterical patients were created and consulted not only by the hospital's doctors, but also by those who frequented Charcot's public lectures. Charcot's audiences were composed of doctors, artists, politicians, actors and writers, who all huddled together to watch the celebrity doctor and his equally famous star hysterics. There were no clear boundaries between the images created from within the hospital walls and those created on the outside as medical and non-medical men alike borrowed from one another in order to add to the production of representations of hysteria. Brouillet's painting, widely reproduced as a photograph and print in medical, artistic and popular publications, embodies and illustrates the fertile and frenzied union of art and medicine during the late nineteenth century in Paris, and highlights the significant role played by Charcot in this merger.³⁸⁵

Contemporary critics described Brouillet's painting as a truthful depiction of life at the Salpêtrière. Often discussed along with Gervex's work, it too was understood as a historical document that accurately recorded Parisian medical culture. Fourcaud's review in *Revue illustrée*, which published a reproduction of *Une leçon clinique*, claimed that, "il serait difficile de consacrer par un tableau plus sincère le souvenir des mémorables expériences du docteur Charcot et de l'affluence spéciale qu'elles ont attiré durant ces dernières années, à son cours."³⁸⁶ Ollendorf discussed the painting as an accurate portrayal of Charcot at work, writing that, "La composition conforme à la vérité, est claire et bien comprise; elle met en valeur, sans grossissement et sans artifice, le sujet

³⁸³ The audiences at Charcot's lectures were as large as 500, and during the 1880s, approximately ten women came to see Charcot every day. For a discussion of the popularity of Charcot's lessons, see Elaine Showalter, *Hystories: Hysterical Epidemics and Modern Culture*, pp. 30-37.

³⁸⁴ Charcot, Jean-Martin, "Leçon d'ouverture" *Oeuvres complètes III*, (Paris, 1890), p. 4.

³⁸⁵ In 1922, Léon Daudet recalled the popularity of Brouillet's painting when he wrote in *Les hommes*, "Un tableau de célèbre (et dont les photographies courent les rues) a popularisé ces séances de la Salpêtrière, dont tout Paris s'entretenait il y a trente-cinq ans et auxquelles assistaient mêlés aux médecins, des écrivains, des artistes, des hommes politiques..." L. Daudet, *Les hommes* (Paris, 1922) as cited in Philippe Bata, Marie-Véronique Clin, et al., *André Brouillet 1857-1914*, exh.cat. Musée de la ville de Poitiers, (Poitiers, 2000), p. 104.

³⁸⁶ de Fourcaud (1887), p. 325.

principal, qui est le docteur Charcot.”³⁸⁷ Although Roger Ballu criticized the painting’s composition for its lack of interest, he too praised the work for its realism when he wrote that on a second viewing of the work, “une certaine réalité vous saisit.”³⁸⁸ The painting’s realist effect made the Salon critic of the *Gazette de France* comment that the painting did not demand lengthy viewing because everything in the canvas was visible from the first glance. He wrote, “on n’y voit rien cependant que ce que l’on voit au premier abord; une minute suffit pour admirer la vérité des personnages et de la lumière; il ne reste aucune découverte à faire après cela.”³⁸⁹ For these critics, Brouillet’s realism was understood as evidence that the painting was a sincere recording of reality, whose easily comprehensible narrative and style did not require hours of viewing in order to be understood.

Charcot first arrived at the Salpêtrière in 1862. Although many of his patients were aging women, alcoholics and epileptics, he was best known for his work on hysteria, in particular his conception of *la grande attaque hysterique*, which was considered the most spectacular and drastic of hysterical conditions. Although hysteria was often used as a blanket term to cover various mental and physical symptoms, Charcot’s recorded lectures show that he conceived of multiple forms and types of hysteria. A look through the analytic tables at the back of Charcot’s multi-volumed *Oeuvres complètes* shows that hysteria was categorized by types, symptoms and procedures, including: ovarian, local and infantile hysteria; different forms of the disease based on sex, age and morals; ^aparalysis, epilepsy and convulsions; studies of bodily temperature and eyesight; as well as the absence of symptoms as a symptom of the disease. Charcot and his supporters generally understood hysteria as a localized deformity in the cerebral cortex that, when exposed to a variety of factors, amongst which heredity, sexuality and psychic trauma had roles, produced visible hysterical symptoms. Yet heredity, sexuality, and ^spsychic trauma rarely had visible loci. Organic signs of hysteria were seldom found during autopsies, and despite the multiple magnification tools emerging during the late nineteenth century, the source of hysteria was predominantly ‘unseeable’. Therefore, the visible symptoms of hysteria, which were understood to manifest themselves in the form of bodily seizures, paralyse and social deviance, took on new potency as the visual became essential to its diagnosis. Charcot

³⁸⁷ Ollendorf, pp. 62-63.

³⁸⁸ Ballu, n.p.

³⁸⁹ Meurville, p. XII.

thought that the majority of physical and social symptoms exhibited by living hysterics were the manifestations of invisible organic lesions. Charcot fixed these invisible disturbances to the visible gestures, poses, and paralyses of hysterical patients in order to create a readable map of the disease. Although the exterior of the hysterical body occupied the central role in visual representations, the hysterical interior was nonetheless an area of study. Charcot's *Oeuvres Complètes*, which contain many images of cross-sections of brains and spines, show how doctors sought out, but were unable to find, visible proof inside the hysterical body. By making hysteria visible on the body's exterior, hysteria was constructed as an obvious and readable illness, thus securing it as an object of medical experimentation. Significantly, the visual symptoms of hysteria were also attributed to characteristics that did not fit easily into nineteenth-century conceptions of proper femininity and masculinity.³⁹⁰ For example, homosexuals, women who read 'too much' or men who were 'too emotional' were often classified as hysterical. Hysteria needed to be diagnosed and cured and therefore these 'symptoms' and actions were deemed proof of illness.

By focusing on Brouillet's *Une leçon clinique*, this chapter will explore the ways in which realist modes and mediums dealt with the challenge of representing hysteria. Since the 1980s, Brouillet's canvas has often accompanied chapters and articles dedicated to the study of hysteria yet little attention has been given to the history of the painting itself, to the context in which it was produced or to the contemporary criticism it generated. Salon criticism, although seemingly outside of the medical sphere, is an essential primary source because it provides historical accounts not only of the painting but also of how hysteria and hypnosis were understood. It also shows what notions of medicine had permeated lay consciousness, and demonstrates the close connections between the worlds of art and medicine, locating *Une leçon clinique* as a site of this pairing. By examining the painting's relationship to other nineteenth-century renderings of the hysterical female body in both medical and non-medical contexts, I will show how painting, photography, casting, hypnosis and electrotherapy were competing and corresponding forms of realism. I will argue that *Une leçon clinique* highlights the essential role of realism in representations of hysteria, and subsequently, realism's role in the construction of hysteria as a *real* disease: the painting is simultaneously a realistic

³⁹⁰ For a discussion of the characteristics that were understood as hysterical in men see Vernon A. Rosario, "Pointy Penises, Fashion Crimes, and Hysterical Mollies: The Pederasts' Inversion", Jeffrey W. Merrick and Bryant Ragan (eds), *Homosexuality in Modern France* (New York, 1996), pp. 146-176, and Mark S. Micale, "Charcot and the Idea of Hysteria in the Male", *Medical History*, 34, pp. 363-411.

image of hysteria *and* a realistic portrayal of realistic representations of hysteria. By examining the troubles with these images, objects and procedures, and the ways in which different forms of realism put pressure on one another, I will argue that the hysterical female body, in representation and as a living body, was a site upon which realisms ‘went mad’, where realist media competed, where some fell apart and others were made stronger.³⁹¹

Hysteria Beyond Construction and Rebellion

Most twenty- and twenty-first-century scholars have focused on hysteria as a socially constructed category invented out of sexual, professional or institutional desire.³⁹² Georges Didi-Huberman, in his indepth study of the iconography of hysteria at the Salpêtrière, has conceptualized the extraordinary quantity and character of hysterical symptoms as a “paradox of spectacular evidence.” He points out that despite the multiplicity of symptoms, hysteria arose out of nothing as nineteenth-century physicians were unable to locate hysteria’s organic existence.³⁹³ Although many nineteenth-century critics of Charcot, particularly Doctor Berheim from Nancy, ridiculed his conception of hysteria, believing he made it up, hysteria was nonetheless relatively accepted in the popular imagination as a mental disease. In contrast, hysteria since the mid-twentieth century appears to have been removed from its medical context, coming in and out of academic fashion as an area of study and debate. The scholarly fascination with hysteria that resurfaced in the 1970s, with the emergence of French psychoanalytic feminism, and in the 1980s, as exemplified in the now classic collection of essays published in *Hysteria Beyond Freud* in 1993, provided essential information and provocative readings of this nineteenth-century phenomenon. Elaine Showalter, Sander Gilman, Georges Didi-Huberman, Elisabeth Bronfen, Ruth Harris, Jann Matlock, Mark Micale, Janet Beizer, Jill Harsin, Charles Bernheimer, Claire Kahane and Jan Goldstein, amongst others, have

³⁹¹ I am concentrating on the female body because, although forty percent of Charcot’s case histories of hysteria concerned working-class men, the majority of visual representations of hysterical patients were of women. For histories of hysteria and its connection to the female body, see Helen King, “Once upon a text: Hysteria from Hippocrates”, pp. 3-90, and G.S. Rousseau “‘A Strange Pathology’: Hysteria in the early modern world, 1500-1800”, pp. 92-224, in Sander Gilman, et al. *Hysteria Beyond Freud* (London, 1993).

³⁹² For a comprehensive account of the secondary literature on hysteria up to 1989 see Mark S. Micale, “Hysteria and its Historiography: A Review of Past and Present Writing”, *History of Science*, 27, 1989, pp. 223-261. For a more recent account see Elisabeth Bronfen, *The Knotted Subject: Hysteria and its Discontents* (Princeton, 1998), pp. 101-138.

³⁹³ Georges Didi-Huberman, *Invention of Hysteria: Charcot and the Photographic Iconography of the Salpêtrière*, trans. Alisa Hartz (Cambridge, 2003, originally published in France 1982), pp. 74-75.

written invaluable his/her/hystor(ies) of hysteria.³⁹⁴ Within this context, the word 'history' itself appears to have gone through its own hysterical transformation, cut and codified to symbolize its multiple personalities.

The history of hysteria since the late nineteenth century can be seen as a battle of constructs as one representation is born out of another in the pursuit of the most 'real' and 'true' depiction of hysteria. Crudely put, Freud famously rejected Charcot's emphasis on the visual and turned to language in order to create a concept of hysteria that would fulfil his aims.³⁹⁵ In response to Freud and other psychoanalytic writing emerging from Freudian theory, feminists, working within psychoanalytic theory, such as Hélène Cixous, Catherine Clément and Luce Irigaray, sought to create a new model of hysteria by questioning the exclusion of female subjectivity in patriarchal culture. Other historians and philosophers, exemplified by Michel Foucault, have explored the social, historical and political forces that contributed to hysteria's construction. In this sense, the more recent examinations of hysteria appear to mimic nineteenth-century medical investigations of the hysterical body, as both reveal more about the desires and motivations of the examiner than the examined. This is particularly evident in the work of some feminist writers and artists, particularly those who were engaged in the feminist movement of the late 1960s and '70s, such as Hélène Cixous, who conceptualized hysteria as a form of feminist rebellion.³⁹⁶ Feminist artists Mary Kelly and Beth B also actively engaged with the discourse of hysteria and the iconography of the Salpêtrière, but to different ends. In her project *Interim*, first shown in 1985, Mary Kelly created a work that disallowed any overt objectification of women while simultaneously making reference to Charcot and Salpêtrière.³⁹⁷ In contrast, Beth B's work *Hysteria 2000* from 2000 reveals the artist's attempt to criticize the medical constructs and images of hysteria

³⁹⁴ Key secondary texts on hysteria include: Mark S. Micale, *Approaching Hysteria* (Princeton, 1994), Charles Bernheimer and Claire Kahane, *In Dora's Case: Freud-Hysteria-Feminism* (New York, 1985), Sander L. Gilman, *Seeing the Insane: A Cultural History of Medicine* (New York, 1982), Jan Goldstein, *Console and Classify: The French Psychiatric Profession in the Nineteenth Century* (New York, 1987), Ruth Harris, *Murders and Madness: Medicine, Law and Society in the fin-de-siècle* (Oxford, 1989), Janet Beizer, *Ventriloquized Bodies: Narratives of Hysteria in Nineteenth-Century France* (Ithaca, 1994) and Jann Matlock, *Scenes of Seduction: Prostitution, Hysteria, and Reading the Difference in Nineteenth-Century France* (New York, 1994).

³⁹⁵ For a discussion of the relationship between Freud and Charcot, see Sander L. Gilman *The Case of Sigmund Freud: Medicine and Identity at the Fin de Siècle* (Baltimore, 1995).

³⁹⁶ For a discussion of feminism and hysteria see Elaine Showalter, "Hysteria, Feminism, and Gender", *Hysteria Beyond Freud*, pp. 286-344, and Showalter "Politics, Patients and Feminism" in *Hystories*, pp. 49-61.

³⁹⁷ For a discussion of Mary Kelly's *Interim* project, particularly the section titled *Corpus*, see Mary Kelly, *Interim* (New York, 1990) and Margaret Iversen, Douglas Crimp and Homi K. Bhabha, *Mary Kelly* (London, 1997).

through a feminist appropriation of medicalized images of women.³⁹⁸ To a certain extent, academic debates surrounding hysteria remain grounded within feminist projects, as both Carol Armstrong and Judith Surkis's recent reviews of the 2003 English translation of Didi-Huberman's book attest.³⁹⁹

Despite the widely accepted understanding of hysteria as a socially, historically and/or psychically constructed category in current academic scholarship, hysteria, as it exists today, remains under discussion. Signified by numerical coding and chemical imbalances, hysteria as it is currently conceived within a medical context is no longer very accessible to those outside of the medical sphere as representations of hysteria have become relatively body-less. The word hysteria has itself been largely written out of medical texts. Elaine Showalter argues that hysteria still exists but under different names and attached to different bodies: chronic fatigue syndrome, multiple personality disorder and Gulf War syndrome are but three 'new' hysterias.⁴⁰⁰ For Showalter, hysteria is "a mimetic disorder; it mimics culturally permissible expressions of distress."⁴⁰¹ Despite the invisibility of these illnesses, they nonetheless exist in representation, fixed on the human body. As is evident by the numerous images of depressed and fatigued bodies that fill the covers of tabloids today, and current news stories about the British Ministry of Defence stopping all payments to soldiers suffering from Gulf War Syndrome because of the disease's invisibility (and therefore seeming improbability), the public's desire to find physical evidence of invisible diseases, particularly mental disorders, remains focused on the body's visible exterior. Similarly, the representations of hysterical bodies emerging from the Salpêtrière, particularly those commissioned by Charcot, epitomize a historical period in which the visibility of disease and its depiction on the body's surface was paramount.

During the nineteenth century, as today, sick bodies needed to be visually documented so that they could be studied and understood. The hysterical body posed problems because it could never be just one thing or hold just one pose. Definitions of hysteria were always changing and shifting. The frenzied character of hysteria and its

³⁹⁸ For an account of the relationship between Beth B's *Hysteria 2000* and Salpêtrière iconography, see Kemp and Wallace, pp. 176-183.

³⁹⁹ Both authors disagree with Didi-Huberman's view of the hysterical woman as a desiring subject rather than object of the medical gaze. See Carol Armstrong, "Probing Pictures: Carol Armstrong on Georges Didi-Huberman – *Invention of Hysteria: Charcot and the Photographic Iconography of the Salpêtrière*", *Art Forum*, September 2003, online, and Judith Surkis, "Review of Didi-Huberman", *H-France Review*, 4, 4 January 2004.

⁴⁰⁰ Showalter (1997), pp. 115-201.

⁴⁰¹ Showalter (1997), p. 15.

public understanding is evident in Jules Claretie's *Les amours d'un interne*, when the character, Pedro, defines hysteria as:

C'est plutôt un détraquement général du système nerveux. Ça peut être érotique – pour donner raison au vulgaire, – ça peut être sombre, ça peut être mystique, ça peut être religieux, ça peut être tout. L'hystérique mange trop ou ne mange rien, dort trop ou ne dort pas assez, semble absorbée comme une idiote ou exaltée comme une folle; elle aime le tapage, les couleurs violentes, les inventions romantiques, veut qu'on s'occupe d'elle, et qu'on ne s'occupe que d'elle; elle est dehors de la règle de commune, et le monde et le demi-monde, le théâtre, les salons, tout Paris est plein d'hystériques, dont la maladie parfaitement caractérisée aurait besoin des soins du doctor Charcot...C'est même la grande maladie moderne, l'hystérie! La société souffre d'une névrose ou d'une névrite gigantesque.⁴⁰²

As Pedro's description attests, hysteria was popularly conceptualized by opposing forces, contradictions and exaggerations. It was simultaneously assigned only to women institutionalized at the Salpêtrière and to the whole of modern society. Hysteria was defined as both everything and nothing: its everything-ness and its nothing-ness were essential to its definition. The hysterical body had to be many things at once. It needed to be ~~sexed~~^{eroticized} for novels and public spectacle but sick and disordered for medical study. The hysterical body always held the promise and threat of transformation. Like conceptions of the anesthetized body, the unknowability of hysteria was a part of its power because the body remained secret despite being subject to constant study, examination and dissection. Representational methods had to account for this malleability and transformation, and therefore visual images of hysterical bodies were simultaneously products and producers of this representational insanity.

Medical books coming from the Salpêtrière merged artistic methods and mediums in order to create images and objects that were considered as true to life as possible. This is evident in Charcot's *Oeuvres Complètes* that are filled with colour lithographs, etchings, woodcuts, drawings, black and white photographs and coloured graphs. Different media were understood to have varying strengths, weaknesses and uses: photography was believed to capture moments, casting to hold poses, and drawing and painting to show drama, movement and expression. The representations in these books were not only intricately related to one another but also to other iconographical precedents and artistic conventions. The images had to work together to produce the effect of the real. In order to be realistic, representations of hysteria had to account for

⁴⁰² Jules Claretie, *Les amours d'un interne* (Paris, 1881), p. 122.

the elasticity of its definition yet such images could not always provide the stable recordings that were needed for medical study. The images and objects produced at the Salpêtrière reveal the ways in which medical men included and excluded elements of reality in order to fulfil their desire to create a secure and readable iconography of hysteria.

Visual Borrowing: Charcot's Clinic, Books and Commissions

Une leçon clinique shows Charcot standing before an all male audience. Packed tightly into the amphitheatre of the Salpêtrière, the suited male bodies dominate the canvas, forming a black block of uniformity. Eyes fixed forward, the audience watch Charcot as he discusses the hypnotic state of his star hysteric, who lies in the arms of the young intern, Doctor Babinsky.⁴⁰³ Close by, two nurses stand at the ready. *Une leçon clinique* is a group portrait showing Parisian professionals from various disciplines. Many newspapers and Salon reviews discussed those depicted, and printed a diagram with the names of those portrayed (Fig. 155). The work shows men whose professional identities depended on their ability to observe, monitor and record the hysteric's body. Brouillet symbolically shows this alliance pictorially by focusing all of the protagonists' eyes on the arched female figure: the hysteric becomes the site of medical, artistic, literary and political convergence as all eyes, save those of Charcot, are on the woman's hypnotized body. The crowd painted by Brouillet attests to the ways in which the creation of hysteria was representative of the entanglement of art, medicine, literature and politics. In the painting, Doctor Paul Richer is positioned sitting to the left of Charcot, pen in hand, recording the movements of doctor and patient. His role as illustrator at the Salpêtrière was emphasized by Brouillet, who reproduced in paint Richer's drawing of a hysterical woman in the midst of *une grande attaque* on the amphitheatre wall (Fig. 156). This illustration of a semi-clothed woman with an arched back is typical of those reproduced in various Salpêtrière publications, including those in Richer's 1881 book *L'hystéro-épilepsie ou Grande Hystérie* (Fig. 157, 158). It also parallels the hysterical body in *Une leçon clinique*. Brouillet's rendering of Richer's work also refers to the key role of visual aids in Charcot's lectures: photographs, drawings, chalkboards, light projectors and actual bodies were used during his lessons. As Charcot's contemporary Henri

⁴⁰³ All biographical information on the people depicted in *Une leçon clinique* is from J.L. Signoret, "Une Leçon Clinique a la Salpêtrière (1887) par André Brouillet", *Revue Neurologique*, 139, 12, 1983, pp. 696-699, Jean Thuillier, *Monsieur Charcot de la Salpêtrière* (Paris, 1993), p. 227 and Nadine Simon-Dhouailly, pp. 4-5, 20-21.

Ellenberger recalled, "The podium was always decorated with pictures and anatomical schemata pertaining to the day's presentation."⁴⁰⁴

Une leçon clinique also shows Doctor Paul Berbez, taking notes and wearing a monocle, and Doctor Bourneville, editor of the *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*, leaning his head against that of the politician Doctor Alfred Joseph Naquet. The head photographer of the hospital, Albert Londe, is portrayed sitting in the far left foreground. The writer Jules Claretie, who wrote the books *L'obsession, moi et l'autre*, about a painter with a second personality, and *Les amours d'un interne*, is positioned next to Naquet and in front of the novelist Paul Arène (who would later dedicate his 1889 novel *La Chèvre d'Or* to Charcot). In the back row stand Philippe Burty, art critic, collector and art advisor to Madame Charcot, Doctor Maurice Debove, social crusader against syphilis, Doctor Victor Cornil, politician interested in medico-legal reform, and Mathias Duval, professor of anatomy at the École des Beaux-Arts as well as hypnosis expert.⁴⁰⁵ Salon critics believed the hysterical patient portrayed by Brouillet was Blanche Wittman. Wittman, along with Augustine, was one of Charcot's star hysterics, and he used her for many of his demonstrations. Wittman's prominent status at the Salpêtrière and in its publications was noted by Georges Guinon who wrote in 1889 that a "femme nommée Witt...dont l'observation se trouve dans tant de travaux sur l'hystérie, émanant de l'école de la Salpêtrière, était une grande hypnotique."⁴⁰⁶ The hysterical body provided these men with an object of study, a seductive character for fashionable novels, a model to be illustrated, photographed and sculpted, as well as a rebellious citizen in need of surveillance. The hysteric's body was a vehicle for financial and professional gain as it became the object of inquiry for diverse disciplines. Different spheres used each other's constructions, including and excluding details, in order to make hysteria their own. The crowd depicted by Brouillet attests to the way in which hysteria was believed to require an interdisciplinary representation. Unconscious, diseased, and under the surveillance of medical, political, literary and artistic men, the hysterical female body in *Une leçon clinique* is shown as material and muse, her identity dependant on Charcot, the audience and Brouillet.

⁴⁰⁴ Henri Ellenberger, "Charcot and the Salpêtrière School" as cited in Mark S. Micale, *Beyond the Unconscious: Essays of Henri F. Ellenberger in the History of Psychiatry* (Princeton, 1993), p. 139.

⁴⁰⁵ For a discussion of Duval's role in artistic and medical representations of bodies, see Anthea Callen, "Doubles and Desire: Anatomies of masculinity in the late nineteenth century", *Art History*, vol. 26, no. 5, November 2003, pp. 669-699.

⁴⁰⁶ Georges Guinon, *Les Agents Provocateur de l'hystérie* (Paris, 1889), p. 208.

Salon critics discussed the painting's narrative with ease and familiarity. They recognized Charcot, unproblematically located the work at the Salpêtrière, and took pleasure in describing the patient and audience. Charcot and his lectures were well known during the last decades of the century - both before and after *Une leçon clinique's* exhibition at the Salon - particularly his Tuesday and Sunday lectures that were open to the public. In 1893, Gaston Tissandier described Charcot's lessons as having a "vogue considérable" and wrote that, "Depuis de longues années, les leçons du maître, pratiquées à la Salpêtrière sur la grande névrose, sur l'hypnotisme, sur les différentes formes de l'hystérie ont attiré l'attention universelle."⁴⁰⁷ Félix Platel (^{pseud.} Ignotus) also discussed their popularity in *Les hommes de mon temps*, writing that, "M. Charcot est devenu surtout célèbre par ses exhibitions de la Salpêtrière. La public entre là."⁴⁰⁸ The masses who attended Charcot's lectures were described by Doctor A Cartaz in 1878:

La presse s'est occupée dans ces derniers temps d'expériences et de démonstrations sur le somnambulisme et le magnétisme, faites par M. le docteur Charcot à la Salpêtrière. Depuis plusieurs années, l'éminent professeur a inauguré, en dehors de son enseignement officiel, une série de leçons cliniques sur les maladies nerveuses dont son service est si abondamment pourvu. Ces leçons qui ont lieu chaque dimanche à neuf heures et demie, dans une salle de plus en plus insuffisante pour le grand nombre d'auditeurs, portent, comme je viens de dire, sur la démonstration des principaux types de névroses...⁴⁰⁹

Visual and textual representations of Charcot's lectures were prevalent and contributed to the doctor's fame and notoriety. In the pictures that accompany Cartaz's text, Charcot is shown performing different medical procedures on hysterical women. In the first image, Charcot is depicted projecting light directly at a woman as a means of inducing her into a cataleptic trance (Fig. 159). In the second picture, Charcot is shown in the midst of a clinical lecture; catalepsy is produced in a female patient through the sound vibrations emitted from an over-sized tuning fork (Fig. 160). His gesturing hands and outward look indicate that he is addressing a larger crowd not depicted in the prints. In contrast to Charcot, who is leading the lecture, the hysterical patient is positioned as the object of scientific inquiry. Young and old doctors study her pathological state while Charcot explains her illness. Her sick condition is created by its opposition to the medical men, who are shown as healthy intellectuals by their steady gazes, standing bodies and the medical tools and books in their hands.

⁴⁰⁷ Gaston Tissandier, "J.-M Charcot", *La Nature*, 26 August 1893, pp. 193-194.

⁴⁰⁸ Félix Platel (^{pseud.} Ignotus), *Les Hommes de mon temps* (Paris, c. 1889), p. 378.

⁴⁰⁹ Doctor A. Cartaz, "Du somnambulisme et du magnétisme à propos du cours du Dr Charcot à la Salpêtrière" in *La Nature*, 7 December 1878, p. 102.

The images' reproduction in a popular scientific journal imbued the prints with the truth claims made by journalism and science. The assumption that these prints were accurate depictions of life at the Salpêtrière was further implied not only by realist formal strategies and the correspondence between the article's descriptive text and the detailed images, but also by the text beneath the prints that claims they were "dessiné d'après nature à la Salpêtrière." Such statements were particularly popular in medical textbooks, such as those produced at Saint-Louis, where the connection between image and reality needed to appear as close-knit as possible. The desire to link the representation with an actual witnessed event is also evident in Charcot's *Oeuvres Complètes*, particularly the first volume, where a few images are labelled as "Dessinée par P. Richer, d'après un croquis fait sur nature par M. Charcot" (Fig. 161).⁴¹⁰ Although Doctor Paul Richer's drawing was not based on direct observation of a living body, his images were imbued with a claim to truth by being based on Charcot's alleged study after nature. Richer's representation's distance from the actual event did not appear to decrease its validity as a truthful document.

Although the prints published in *La Nature* do not depict the exact same moment and lecture as Brouillet's painting, which was painted roughly nine years later, the second print in particular serves as a typical example of nineteenth-century representations of Charcot lecturing at the Salpêtrière and shares many similarities with *Une leçon clinique*: the narrative appears clear and legible; men are represented as knowledgeable professionals whose field of study is directed towards a female body; hysteria is constructed as a female disease; men are shown as conscious and intellectually engaged while the female hysteric is depicted in an unconscious or semi-conscious state; medical study is represented as a performative and spectacular act as Charcot and the hysterical patient are shown in a lecture theatre in front of a crowd; hysteria is constructed as a disease that requires multiple forms of representation, experimentation and study, as men surround the female body carrying with them the necessary tools and books needed to understand and record the hysterical female body. Images reproduced in Salpêtrière produced books, such as Bourneville and Régnaud's *Iconographie photographique de la Salpêtrière* (1878) and Régnaud's *Les maladies épidémiques de l'esprit* (1887), also contain similar images of doctors performing acts on patients (Fig. 162, 163). Although

⁴¹⁰ Charcot, Jean-Martin, *Oeuvres Complètes* (Paris, 1892), pp. 389-390.

most of these images infer that a crowd is present, as patients and doctors are shown facing out, these images do not show the audience.

Although it is likely that the men portrayed in *Une leçon clinique* had all frequented Charcot's lectures, it is doubtful that they all attended the same event and all followed Charcot's beliefs. Doctor Dubray questioned the validity of the grouping in his Salon review when he wrote, "MM. Jules Clarétie, Alfred Naquet et Paul Arène ne suivent pas normalement, que je sache, les leçons de M. Charcot..."⁴¹¹ There were well-known conflicts between men in the picture and therefore it is doubtful that all of the men gathered for the portrait or were willing to sit next to each other. Weisberg has pointed out that although the painting shows members of the audience taking notes, two of Charcot's interns who were responsible for recording the lectures, Doctors Colin and Blin, are missing from the portrait.⁴¹² Therefore, it is certainly the case that *Une leçon clinique* is a fictional grouping whose purpose was to show the impact Charcot had on various disciplines and exhibit both Charcot and Brouillet's contact with men of the Parisian élite. The artifice of this gathering coincides with that of group portraiture: both used the rhetoric of realism and the genre of portraiture to construct communities and identities as natural and cohesive.⁴¹³ Yet the artificiality of Brouillet's fictional audience ultimately contradicts the truth claims implied by realist formal strategies and the representation of recognizable Parisian figures. Paradoxically, it was this fictional grouping that contributed to Salon critics' praise for the painting's accuracy and ability to serve as a historical document.

Although representations of hysteria were published in both popular and medical magazines, Charcot was always presented as the ringleader. His colleague, Professor Joffroy, wrote an article in 1893 that credited Charcot with the full discovery and treatment of hysteria:

Quant à l'hystérie on peut dire qu'il l'a créée presque de toutes pièces...Charcot...établit avec une précision remarquable les principales scènes du tableau morbide, fait en quelque sorte l'histoire naturelle des phénomènes hystériques, fixe les lois qui les régissent, montre les transformations, les variétés, les équivalents de la grande attaque, indique les stigmates et les moyens de les déceler, étudie enfin les circonstances étiologiques qui font naître l'hystérie,

⁴¹¹ Doctor P. Dubray, "Promenades au Salon", *Union Médicale*, 14 May 1887, p. 755.

⁴¹² Weisberg, pp. 439-441. Weisberg also claims that many of Charcot's interns who attended the majority of his lectures, such as Blocq, Hillemand, Valet, Thibault, Achard and Poulalio, are not depicted.

⁴¹³ Richard Brilliant justly points out that group portraits should not be understood as random groupings but as deliberate constructions that display professional personalities as unified. He writes that group portraits "make ideological statements about the values, attitudes and practices shared by their members, and by the portrait painter as well." Brilliant, *Portraiture* (London, 1991), pp. 92-99.

recherche ses rapports avec les autres affections nerveuses, et la nature probable de cette grande névrose. N'est-ce pas là l'histoire complète de l'hystérie?⁴¹⁴

Joffroy's text is exemplary of the way in which Charcot's interns, colleagues and public followers unproblematically accepted the professor's mastery of hysteria and recognized his essential role in its creation. As Félix Platel Ignotus wrote, "Il monopolise l'hystérie."⁴¹⁵ Charcot was seen to provide the study of hysteria with a legitimate and authoritative voice of modern scientific medicine. He served as a role model not only for doctors, but also for artists, novelists and politicians. The multiple and widely published visual representations of hysteria commissioned by Charcot contributed to the widespread domination of his theories of hysteria. The accessibility of images over texts to a non-medical public certainly contributed to Charcot's domination in the public imagination.

The importance Charcot placed on visual observation and the creation of visual records in the diagnosis of mental diseases was regarded by medical men, such as Doctor Henri Meige, as an innovation because visual observation extended and reinforced the nineteenth-century empiricist faith in vision.⁴¹⁶ Sigmund Freud, a student of Charcot's during the mid-1880s, emphasized Charcot's reliance on the visual when, on the occasion of Charcot's death in 1893, he recalled that Charcot called himself a " 'visuel', a man who sees....He used to look again and again at things he did not understand, to deepen his impression of them day by day, till suddenly an understanding of them dawned on him...."⁴¹⁷ Although there was a tension between laboratory science, that proved that not everything was visible, and clinical study, that focused on visual diagnosis, the anatomic-clinical method was nonetheless considered scientific, modern and successful.⁴¹⁸ As is evident in Charcot's *Oeuvres Complètes*, where photomicrography, a laboratory tool, is shown alongside etchings of bodies' exteriors, laboratory study was seen as compatible with clinical observation.

It was well documented that Charcot wanted his patients to be undressed when he viewed them so that he could 'read' their entire bodies for signs of illness. His former interns Souques and Meige described Charcot's lesson as follows:

⁴¹⁴ M. Joffroy, "Jean Martin Charcot (1825-1893)", *Archives de Médecine expérimentale et d'Anatomie Pathologiques*, 1893, 5, pp. 27-28.

⁴¹⁵ Ignotus, p. 383.

⁴¹⁶ Henri Meige, "Charcot Artiste", *Apollon*, 17, 1929, pp. 41-53.

⁴¹⁷ Freud, Sigmund, "Charcot", *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, James Strachey (ed), volume III (London, 1962).

⁴¹⁸ For a brief discussion of how Charcot and other nineteenth-century practitioners' procedures and processes were considered scientific, see Bynum, pp. 92-95, 109, 217.

He sits down near a bare table, and immediately has the patient to be studied brought in. The patient is then completely stripped. The intern reads the 'observation,' while the Master listens attentively. Then there is a long silence during which he gazes; he gazes at the patient and drums his fingers on the table. The assistants are standing, crowded together, anxiously awaiting a word that will shed some light. Charcot remains silent. Then he instructs the patient to move in a certain way, makes her speak, asks for her reflexes to be measured, for her sensitivity to be examined. And again he falls silent, Charcot's mysterious silence. Finally he brings in a second patient, examines her like the first, calls for a third, and still without a word, compares them. This minute observation, primarily visual, is the source of all of Charcot's discoveries. The artist who, in this case, goes hand in hand with the doctor, is not extraneous to his discoveries."⁴¹⁹

Charcot's medical examinations required that naked bodies be examined and compared to one another in order to produce diagnoses and generate medical knowledge: diseases had to be named, symptoms listed and bodies categorized. Looking and classifying bodies was essential to creating proof and improving professional skills. For Charcot, like other doctors and scientists, taxonomies of diseases needed to be formed in order to enrich and expand not only the discipline of medicine, but French medicine in particular. Visual representations of bodies contributed to this taxonomic project. Like the images, objects and books produced at Saint-Louis, the Pasteur Institute and the Académie de Médecine, those commissioned by Charcot were also seen to advance modern scientific French medicine. Charcot, like Péan, was praised for creating classifications and modernizing medicine. Doctor G. Daremberg wrote that, "Charcot a mis de l'ordre et de la précision dans une foule de questions médicales qui n'étaient que désordre avant lui,"⁴²⁰ and Bianchon claimed that, "c'est lui le rénovateur, le grand initiateur à la méthode moderne – compte par centaines ces victoires scientifiques; et les meilleurs, en Allemagne, dérivent de Charcot ou de notre Pasteur."⁴²¹ Following scientific theories, and categorizing bodies and diseases, helped construct Charcot, like Pasteur, as a scientific leader and national hero.

Charcot's emphasis on visuality and his active role in the creation of visual records encouraged his followers to promote his identity not only as a doctor but also as an artist. As Debora Silverman convincingly shows in her discussion of the Charcot family's interest in aesthetics, the integration of art into medicine fulfilled a personal desire for Charcot, who, like Pasteur and Péan, had been forced to choose between

⁴¹⁹ As cited in Georges Guillain, *J.-M Charcot. Sa vie. Son oeuvre.* (Paris, 1955), p. 51.

⁴²⁰ As quoted in Tissandier (1893), p. 194.

⁴²¹ Bianchon, p. III.

medical and artistic training.⁴²² Although Charcot drew his own representations of hysteria, he was best known for those he commissioned. Like his predecessors at the Salpêtrière, such as Philippe Pinel, Charcot added to the iconography of the insane not only in order to fulfil his desire to make hysteria visible but to take part in the larger republican project of strengthening French hospitals through the cataloguing and collecting of taxonomies of diseases. His role at the Salpêtrière was similar to that of Péan at Saint-Louis and Pasteur at the Pasteur Institute. Charcot published numerous illustrated texts about hysteria and created rooms and departments at the Salpêtrière that concentrated on the production of visual representations of diseases. He created rooms for the creation and display of wax models, plaster casts and photographs.

Charcot secured money for a photographic studio for the hospital in 1878. Doctors Bourneville and Régnaud thanked Charcot for being the force behind this new room as well as behind the multiple volumes of the *Iconographie photographique de la Salpêtrière*, which were published in 1875, 1877, 1878 and 1879-1880. These books were filled with writing, drawings, engravings and photographs. The front pages of the books showed the Salpêtrière itself, a majestic building with a heavy dome. This constructed the hospital not only as a venue for medical curing but also for the creation of visual images (Fig. 164). As one turns the pages of these books, line drawings and photographs of hysterical women in various stages of hysterical attacks and in various states of undress and consciousness appear. These books were regarded as scientific texts that were made for the medical community even though the images eventually formed a basic visual language of hysteria that was also used in the popular press.⁴²³ The books fitted into Charcot's project of creating a taxonomy of hysteria and served as textbooks that helped doctors and medical students with diagnosis. Their layout and the emphasis on images contributed to the belief that they could provide a complete taxonomy of physical symptoms. The many volumes of *Iconographie photographique* played a key role in the visualisation of hysteria because they set a precedent for the creation of books and periodicals dedicated to the depiction of the disease and encouraged the use of photography in medical books. The influence of these books is evident by the creation of *Nouvelle Iconographie de la Salpêtrière* by Richer, Londe and Gilles de Tourette in 1888,

⁴²² For an in-depth account of Charcot's personal interest in art, see Debora Silverman, *Art Nouveau in fin-de-siècle France: Politics, Psychology and Style* (Berkeley, 1989), pp. 75-106.

⁴²³ For an account of the original purpose of the books see Bourneville's preface to *Iconographie photographique de la Salpêtrière* (Paris, 1877), pp. iii-iv.

which also used photographs and other visual images in order to construct and convey medical knowledge.

Along with medical textbooks, Charcot wrote two books with Paul Richer that were created for both a public and medical audience: *Les Démoniaques dans l'art* (1887) and *Les difformes et les malades dans l'art* (1889). These books provided entertainment and education as they merged contemporary medical thought with the public's interest in art and hysteria. In these books, Charcot and Richer re-wrote the history of hysteria, and the history of art, by discussing what they believed to be earlier examples of hysteria, drawing connections between famous art of the past and contemporary medical iconography. Even before these books were published, Charcot drew links between contemporary representations of hysteria and those he believed to be of the past by reproducing a sketch by Rubens in the 1877 edition of *Iconographies photographiques* (Fig. 165). Charcot first hired Richer to illustrate and sculpt the bodily contortions of hysterical patients in 1878. Richer's work formed a large part of the collection of the Salpêtrière's Musée Anatomico-Pathologique, which Charcot also founded in 1878. Charcot notably offered Richer an internship after the famous neurologist had seen his drawings and claimed that, "on ferait le diagnostic sur ces dessins!"⁴²⁴ Realistic and accurate drawings, like medical wax models, were understood to stand in for the living body of patients. As Charcot's quotation attests, Richer's ability to draw was connected to his ability to diagnose. Richer was also responsible for creating an illustrated chart of Charcot's conception of the *grand attaque hystérique* in Charcot's *Études cliniques* of 1881. Each phase of the attack drawn by Richer shows a female body in various stages of undress and in multiple bodily contortions (Fig. 166). The chart aims to record every movement of the hysterical body as it proceeds towards the hysterical climax of the *arc en cercle*. These drawings create a pattern of bodily movement that appears proto-cinematic and similar to flipbooks. The chart allowed doctors to diagnose the hysterical state of their patients by comparing their patients' bodies with those drawn by Richer and labelled by Charcot. As photography was not yet technically able to catch the body in motion clearly until the 1890s, Richer's drawings were regarded as providing the most accurate and studied visual representations of the progress of a hysterical attack. Richer's desire to illustrate the bodily action that was central to hysterical fits is also evident in

⁴²⁴ Richer's influence on French art was celebrated. For a nineteenth-century discussion of his interest in the arts, see Raphaël Blanchard, *Hommage à M. de Dr Paul Richer, member de l'Académie de Médecine, Professeur d'anatomie à l'école des Beaux-Arts, à l'occasion de son élection à l'Académie des Beaux-Arts, 22 Juillet, 1905*. (Paris, 1906), p. 10.

both *L'hystéro-Epilepsie ou Grande Hystérie* and *Les Démoniaques dans l'art* where lines are drawn around figures to symbolize movement (Fig. 167, 168). Richer's respected and celebrated position as both artist and doctor exemplifies the nineteenth-century emphasis on the role of visuality in medical diagnosis and study. Richer's identity as a man who linked art and medicine would be secured through his appointment as Professor of Anatomy at the École des Beaux-Arts in July 1905.⁴²⁵ Professor Raphaël Blanchard's congratulatory speech praised Richer for creating "une source précieuse de documents pour l'histoire médico-artistique...l'Art et la Science, si longtemps étrangers l'un à l'autre, y fraternisent étroitement et vous êtes le principal auteur de cette union féconde."⁴²⁶ Richer's work at the École des Beaux-Arts, particularly his encouragement of the use of photography, reinforced the intimate relationship between art and medicine, and further constructed photography and the human body as the site of this union. Because of its association with objectivity, modernity and science, photography would come to replace drawing as the most rational, accurate and detached medium for imaging the object world.

Charcot's success depended not only on the existence of hysteria in the nineteenth century but on its existence prior to his work at the Salpêtrière. In response to the many people who attacked him, claiming that hysteria would not have existed without him, Charcot 'proved' the historical existence of hysteria by finding representations of the disease in well-known paintings from the Renaissance to the nineteenth century. Visual links taken from the history of art were used to justify his medical theories, and secured Charcot's commissioned photographs and drawings as historical documents that would help doctors in the future. Albert Londe addressed the relationship between art of the past and Charcot's practice when he wrote:

Admirens en passant ces artistes scrupuleux qui ne craignaient pas de reproduire la nature même dans ses laideurs et ses difformités, et nous ont laissé ainsi des documents de la plus haute valeur. Ce rôle qu'ils ont rempli appartient désormais aux médecins, qui peuvent maintenant, grâce à la Photographie, laisser aux siècles futurs des documents iconographiques d'un prix inestimable.⁴²⁷

Londe's writing demonstrates that the medical sphere was increasingly taking a role in the creation of visual representations of bodies; the art world no longer had a monopoly

⁴²⁵ For a discussion of the relationship between doctors and the École des Beaux-Arts, see Callen (1997), p. 23.

⁴²⁶ Blanchard, p. 12.

⁴²⁷ Londe (1892), p. 343.

on the rendering of bodies. Londe, as photographer, also positioned himself as an artist by relating his professional work to that of the 'great' artists of the past.

Les Démoniaques dans l'art and *Les difformes et les maladies dans l'art* also fulfilled a political role for Charcot. As Jan Goldstein has convincingly shown, these images reflected Charcot's anti-clerical stance. Charcot argued, through a series of visual examples, that the saints of the past and other religious figures, particularly those in phases of ecstasy or receiving heavenly visions, were hysterical.⁴²⁸ Through a discussion of religious iconography, particularly representations of female saints, Charcot drew visual parallels between saintly women and the sick patients at the Salpêtrière, thus critiquing and undermining Catholic faith while promoting scientific medicine as the trusted leading force in modern society. The images emerging from the Salpêtrière under Charcot's rule merged the medical and the artistic, the secular and the religious, as well as the ancient and the modern. Photographs and drawings of hysterical patients drew on older religious precedents in order to create a new medical iconography. This is evident when comparing the image by Rubens to drawings by Richer (Fig. 169). Significantly, Richer's obvious iconographical reliance undermines the claims to truth made by himself, Charcot and others at the Salpêtrière, who insisted that their representations of hysteria were objective recordings taken directly from nature.⁴²⁹

The merging of iconographical precedents in the works created at the Salpêtrière also challenges Brouillet's painting's categorization as a realist document, as his visual sources were bound to those on which Charcot relied. His painting appears as a patchwork quilt made out of the images collected and discussed by Charcot and Richer in *Les Démoniaques dans l'art*. Although Brouillet's work depicts a contemporary Parisian scene, its timely display at the Salon, shortly after the publication of *Les Démoniaques dans l'art*, linked Brouillet's visual construction of hysteria with the sixty-seven images in this book, thus aligning the painting with the earlier religious sources discussed by Charcot and Richer. Paul Mantz made reference to Charcot and Richer's popular book in his 1887 Salon review when he wrote that:

...le volume sur les *Démoniaques dans l'art*, un livre dont nous avons été profondément touchés, car il nous a appris que, même en un passé fort lointain, les artistes ont connu les maladies du système nerveux et les convulsions et la

⁴²⁸ Jan Goldstein "The hysterical Diagnosis and the Politics of Anticlericalism in late Nineteenth-Century France", *Journal of Modern History* 54, 2, June 1982, pp. 209-239.

⁴²⁹ Charcot praised Richer's methodological investigation of hysteria in his preface to Richer's *Études cliniques sur la grande hystérie ou hystéro-épilepsie* (Paris, 1881). He commended Richer for his "talent d'artistes" and his "qualité d'observateur consciencieux et saface...".

grande attaque, et que, si quelques-uns en ont donné des représentations amendées ou chimériques, notre ami Rubens a été l'un des plus exacts à traduire par le pinceau le terrible spectacle du phénomène sincèrement observé.⁴³⁰

The hysteric's pose in Brouillet's painting mimics the arched backs of the figures in the images reproduced by Charcot and Richer, where possessed bodies are shown falling into outstretched arms (Fig. 170, 171, 172, 173). The precedent of a sexualized semi-naked female figure is evident in an engraving after Adam van Noort's seventeenth-century work *Sainte Claire délivre une dame de Pie de cinq démons* (Fig. 174). The depiction of a large crowd in an open space is similar to B. Picart's print *Grand Secours* from 1808 (Fig. 175). Brouillet's decision to paint a copy of Richer's drawing to indicate the patient's illness is based on Louis Basile Carré de Montgeron's *La vérité des miracles operas par l'intercession de M. de Pâris et autres appelans démontrée contre M. l'archevêque de sens* from 1745-47, where a drawing of a foot is shown on the wall to indicate the patient's illness (Fig. 176). By painting a modern medical scene filled with doctors and patients, rather than a religious one packed with priests and madmen, Brouillet aligned himself with the 'great' artists of the past that Charcot discussed in the book. His work also showed his belief that modern medical subject matter, rather than religious themes, were required for the production of significant modern French painting. Furthermore, by portraying modern scientific medicine as humane and rational rather than violent and punishing, as it is in *Grand Secours* (Fig. 177), Brouillet constructed Charcot and his practice as more peaceful and intellectual than the Church.

The disintegrating role of religion in medical spheres is also evident in Brouillet's work through his representation of the two nurses. Unlike Gervex's painting, in which a nurse and a nun take part in the operation, *Une leçon clinique* is void of religious figures despite their prominence in French medical institutions. Similarly, nuns were not evident in the photographs emerging from the Salpêtrière, most likely reflecting Charcot's ardent anti-clericalism.⁴³¹ Photographs of hysterical patients and nurses were common in the images produced at the Salpêtrière. The 1875, 1877 and 1879 volumes of *Iconographie photographique* each contain two images of nurses with patients. In the 1879 book, one photograph represents a young nurse holding the body of a cataleptic woman and in

⁴³⁰ Mantz, n.p.

⁴³¹ For a discussion of the anti-clerical politics in the Parisian hospital system, particular the role of nursing in its formation, see Katrin Schultheiss, *Bodies and Souls: Politics and the Professionalization of Nursing in France, 1880-1922* (Cambridge, 2001), Goldstein (1987), pp. 363-364, and Bertrand Taithe, *Defeated Flesh: Welfare, Warfare and the Making of Modern France* (Manchester, 1999), pp. 151-154.

another a nurse stands next to a seated hysteric, staring out at the viewer like a spouse in a marital portrait (Fig. 178, 179). The arching back of the hysteric portrayed in the first photograph parallels the curved posture of the hysteric in Brouillet's painting, Richer's chart and in the many images in *Les Démoniaques dans l'art*. It also recalls another image in the 1879 volume, in which another star hysteric, Augustine, is represented as cataleptic, her back in a full arch (Fig. 180). Significantly, in this photograph, as in many others, Augustine is shown in a nurse's uniform, showing the easy slippage that was believed to exist between hysterical patient and nurse. Many employees at the Salpêtrière began as patients. Perhaps the most well known example was Blanche Wittman, who after her tenure as the hospital's star hysteric worked in the photographic studio and radiology laboratory.

Brouillet alluded to the unstable position of nursing through his representation of a young nurse, Mademoiselle Écary. Although Écary's youth links her to the hysterical patient (and her pose in the painting links her iconographically to the nuns and saints represented in *Les Démoniaques dans l'art*), her professional ties, indicated by her uniform, simultaneously unite her with Madame Bottard, whose married status, indicated by her wedding ring, and aging body construct her as a socially respectable care-giver.⁴³² Nursing was integral to a secular hospital system, as is evidenced by the number of nursing hospitals that opened in Paris during the late nineteenth century. Yet working-class women were confronted with contradictory advice. Working as a nurse was regarded as admirable for its essential role in the care and protection of French health but was also considered shameful because it took women away from child rearing and put them in close contact with illness, prostitutes and desiring doctors. The young nurse represented by Brouillet, like those in the Salpêtrière photographs, is simultaneously shown as the embodiment of anti-clerical republican policies as well as one step away from hysteria. Nurses, like hysterical patients, were defined, educated and controlled by the medical men at the Salpêtrière. Yet unlike the hysteric in Brouillet's painting, who occupies a central role in the canvas, the young nurse is barely present: only her face appears from behind the old nurse. Like the nurse in Gervex's painting, she is also shown as a marginalized figure, necessary in medical spaces yet never a leading force. As is evident in both *Une leçon clinique* and in the many volumes of *Iconographie photographique*, nurses served iconographical and political roles in representations of

⁴³² Mlle Bottard, who worked as a nurse for 48 years, received the Légion d'honneur in 1898. Weisberg, pp. 441-442.

hysteria. They helped display the importance and prominence of doctors by their depiction as subservient figures while their professional status alluded to the prominent anti-clericalism in nineteenth-century medical communities. In both the painting and the books, nurses helped exhibit the identities and political views of medical men by their uniforms and actions rather than by their individual identities. Charcot's involvement in the creation of a new iconography of hysteria reconfigured the relationships between medicine and religion into a political visual language. Charcot's personal and professional politics used representations of nurses' bodies, along with hysterical bodies, in order to advance his anticlerical battles.

“Elle ne confond pas la fantaisie avec la science”: Realism and Light

Brouillet exhibited his familiarity with modern scientific medicine by painting a scene at the Salpêtrière, thus positioning himself as a man who not only had access to Charcot and the privileged audience, but was also a part of this crowd. Similarly to Gervex, Edelfelt, Gsell and Bonnat, Brouillet visually constructed his connection with medical men. This helped imbue his painting and professional identity with the social qualifications to produce and document reality. Like the men in the painting, Brouillet was shown as intricately involved in the creation of a modern medical iconography of hysteria. Although Brouillet did not depict himself in the amphitheatre, the painting's detailed portraits and setting stood as evidence of his presence and powers of observation. *Le Temps*, *Le Monde Illustré* and *Art Français* all commented that Brouillet had first hand experience of the scene. *L'Art Français* claimed that, “...il a vu la scène poignante qu'il retrace avec une réelle émotion.”⁴³³ Mantz wrote, “...qu'avant de peindre, il s'est informé. C'est à la Salpêtrière, c'est en suivant les leçons du maître qu'il a étudié la disposition de la scène, note les détails de l'expérience, précise l'attitude de la malade.”⁴³⁴ Brouillet's known personal experience of Charcot's lectures contributed to the belief that his painting was an accurate record of his time at the Salpêtrière. Through the use of realist formal strategies, Brouillet constructed himself as both witness and documenter of modern medicine and its *élite*. Like Nadar's photographic portraits – which were understood as exact images of historical figures not only because of photography's assumed ability to create objective recordings of visible reality but also because of the

⁴³³ Firmin Javel, “Le Salon”, *L'Art Français*, 1 May 1887, n.p.

⁴³⁴ Mantz, n.p.

photographer's statements – Brouillet's painted portrait was considered evidence of the artist's encounter with these living people at an actual event.

The paintings by Brouillet, Gsell and Gervex all reveal the ambitions of young artists, who, by choosing to paint contemporary and fashionable scenes, were able to get ample notice in Salon reviews, advertise their identity as painters and portraitists, as well as publicize their association with men of social, cultural and political import. Brouillet had achieved success with his painting *Le Paysan blessé* that was bought by the State after its display at the 1886 Salon (Fig. 181).⁴³⁵ Perhaps the success of Edelfelt's portrait of Pasteur at the 1886 Salon encouraged Brouillet to abandon a medical genre painting for something that was considered more modern because of the specificity of its sitter and setting. Although a few critics denounced Brouillet's painterly ability, considering his work inferior to that of Gervex, the painting's scene, depicted figures and style were uniformly regarded as modern.⁴³⁶ Like laboratories and operating rooms, the Salpêtrière clinic, with its electric lights, photographic studio and electrotherapy rooms, was considered a modern scientific space and therefore an ideal venue for modern portraiture.

The painting's description as a realist work was further enhanced by Brouillet's depiction of light. Although critics, such as Mantz, commented on the beauty of Brouillet's painted light, writing that, "M. Brouillet reste ce qu'il a été dès le début, un amoureux de la lumière," his light was also characterized as scientific, thus contributing to the work's understanding as a sincere representation of reality. Mantz prefaced his discussion of Brouillet and Gervex's paintings with, "Dès que la science intervient, la vraie lumière envahit la maison."⁴³⁷ Ollendorf also discussed light in his description of *Une leçon clinique* when he wrote that, "En entrant chez les savants, la lumière s'apaise cependant et se refroidit poliment. Elle prend le ton de la maison. Elle se fait austère et scientifique. Elle ne confond pas la fantaisie avec la science."⁴³⁸ In contrast to the artificial light of public entertainment theatres in Paris, which was used to enhance fantasy and pleasure, the light of the medical theatre in Brouillet's painting was discussed in terms of its severity and objectivity. In his book on the 1887 Salon, Georges Olmer noted the similarity between Brouillet's depiction of light in the clinic and the representation of laboratory light in Ferdinand Gueldry's painting *Au laboratoire*

⁴³⁵ Archives Nationale, côte F/21*7655

⁴³⁶ Hamel wrote, "M. Gervex a fait un oeuvre de bon peinture en traitant une donnée moderne...alors que sur un theme analogue M. Brouillet n'a produit qu'un illusion mediocre." Hamel, p. 479.

⁴³⁷ Mantz, n.p.

⁴³⁸ Ollendorf, p. 61.

municipal (Fig. 182). After praising Gueldry's "tableaux documentaires avec une méticuleuse exactitude et une parfaite méthode," Olmer moved on to discuss Brouillet's work, writing that, "Du laboratoire à la clinique, la distance est courte et la lumière que nous voyons dans le tableau de M. Brouillet ne diffère sensiblement de celle que nous venons d'admirer dans le tableau de M. Gueldry."⁴³⁹ Scientific narratives demanded that light be shown as bright, clear and cold because dark shadows and warm golden hues produced a sense of drama and theatricality that appeared to contradict the assumed objective opticality needed for the representation of modern scientific spaces. Through the use of light coloured paint, crisp lines and the depiction of open windows, Gsell, Gervex, Brouillet and Gueldry all created a light that Salon critics' read as signifying the scientific.

Regardless of being created by his brush, Brouillet's light was understood as real and austere rather than fantasmatic. Merson praised his rendition of light for its clarity and ability to illuminate the faces and details of the picture.⁴⁴⁰ The representation of daylight also referred to Charcot's actual practice, as light was essential to sight and diagnosis. Although Brouillet included gaslights in the painting in order to show that hospitals were modern spaces filled with new technologies, they are not lit. Rather, the room is illuminated by the light that comes through the large glass windows, thus emphasizing the actual over the artificial. Brouillet's work differs from Ignotus' account of Charcot's presentations. Ignotus described Charcot's lectures:

La longue salle est aménagée comme une salle de spectacle. Il est dix heures du matin – et le gaz éclaire ce théâtre fermé avec soin au soleil. Le spectacle commence sans musique, comme au Théâtre-Français. Au fond, sur la scène, par le côté jardin, entre le grand Charcot. Ses clients le suivent.⁴⁴¹

Unlike Brouillet, Ignotus described the rooms as being lit by gas and devoid of natural sunlight, as were theatres. By representing Charcot's clinic in daylight, Brouillet symbolically rid the doctor's lectures of their more spectacular and entertaining value in order to secure Charcot's medicine in the realm of the rational and scientific.

Furthermore, this may also refer to the belief that medicine was a daytime job, prestigious and highly trained, unlike evening work such as performance or bar work, which was done under gas light by uneducated poor hands.⁴⁴²

⁴³⁹ Olmer, p. 62.

⁴⁴⁰ Merson, p. 282.

⁴⁴¹ Ignotus, p. 385.

⁴⁴² I am grateful to Hollis Clayson for discussions with her about light in Paris.

Representations and metaphors of light also symbolized the enlightenment of medical men as light was associated with the discovery of truths, the unearthing of knowledge and the illumination of ideas. Tissandier used metaphors of light to describe Charcot in his obituary of the doctor. He wrote that Charcot's name "brillait avec le plus d'éclat", that Charcot "a éclairé, d'une nouvelle lumière, tout un domaine d'investigation jusqu'à confiné dans les ténèbres" and described how the Salpêtrière "brille d'un vif éclat par les travaux qu'elle a produits et par le nombre des hommes éminents qui la composent."⁴⁴³ Meurville used light as a metaphor for knowledge in his 1887 Salon review when discussing whether or not medical knowledge should be shared by all or kept within the realm of the medical. He concluded that, "quelques médecins répondent que la lumière est toujours profitable..."⁴⁴⁴ Light was understood as a guiding force for modern medicine, as is evident in André Sauger's introduction to J. Hirschler's book *Nos Docteurs*, in which he wrote that it was, "la trouvée lumineuse qui conduira les générations futures, vers l'absolue vérité."⁴⁴⁵ Light was deemed necessary for sight and the pursuit of knowledge, be it in scientific or artistic spheres. Anthea Callen has claimed that light became charged with an ideological force as medical and artistic discourses merged in the gendering of light. She points out that light, as a metaphor and symbol of sight, signified an authoritative masculine power, particularly when scientific optical theories, such as those by Helmholtz and Rood, located light within the overtly masculine space of science. Furthermore, art critics, such as Félix Bracquemond and Charles Blanc, emphasized the importance of light because it symbolized an artist's mastery over colour (often personified as female), showed his ability to represent the world truthfully and exhibited his skills as observer.⁴⁴⁶ Light was often conceptualized as a sexualized masculine force that could dominate female bodies. Titian's *Danae and the Shower of Gold* exemplifies this sexual metaphor as his work shows Zeus' golden shower caressing, and ultimately impregnating, the body of the young Danae (Fig. 183).

The enlightenment of male minds was positioned in opposition to the darkness and mystery of the female body. Doctors and hysterical female patients epitomized this dichotomy. This is symbolized in Brouillet's painting by the bright light that allows the steady and collective gaze of the male audience to focus on the hysterical female body, thus defining their roles as observers and recorders and her role as object. In contrast, the

⁴⁴³ Tissandier (1893), pp. 193-194.

⁴⁴⁴ Meurville, n. p.

⁴⁴⁵ J. Hirschler, *Nos Docteurs* (Paris, 1896), pp. 12-13.

⁴⁴⁶ Callen (1995), pp. 111-137.

hysteric's eyes are half-shut. Her vision is impaired, symbolically showing that she has no access to knowledge, particularly medical knowledge which relied so heavily on visual observation. Although the two nurses in the painting are looking at the hysterical woman, the old nurse's hands, which reach out to catch the falling body, prioritize touch and physical contact over sight. Their identity as nurses locates their role as physical caregivers rather than observers and intellectual curers.

In *Une leçon clinique*, men are shown as powerful forces, in control of light, sight, speech, touch and representation: Charcot addresses the crowd, Doctor Babinsky holds the patient, members of the audience take notes, all of the men look. In contrast, the hysterical woman appears powerless: her consciousness is controlled by medical procedures, her body is held in medical arms and her eyes are closed through hypnosis. As is evident in the print published in Cartaz's article in *La Nature*, in which Charcot is shown directing a spot light directly at a hysterical woman in order to put her into a cataleptic trance, light allowed Charcot to study diseases, create medical knowledge and was also a means through which he could perform medical experiments on patients. In contrast, light blinds the hysterical woman, ridding her of full consciousness as she falls into a hysterical trance. The representation of a spotlight also refers to hysterical women's identities as *vedettes* of the Salpêtrière: Doctor Jules Falret described hysterics as "veritable actresses" in his 1890 medical text *Études cliniques sur les maladies mentales et nerveuses*.⁴⁴⁷ It was commonly assumed that hysterical women were actresses, performing under Charcot's direction.⁴⁴⁸ It was suspected that hiding behind the passive surface of their hypnotized and sick bodies were powerful and deceitful women.

Hysterical women were simultaneously constructed as powerless and powerful. Doctor Janet claimed that hysterical women were passive to the desires of medical men but always demanded something in return. He wrote that hysterics had an:

... extraordinary attachment to their physician. The doctor who attends them is no longer an ordinary man. He assumes a preponderant position, against which no other influence can prevail. For him they will do everything; for they have once and for all made up their mind to obey him blindly; they think of him all the time and regulate their whole conduct after that thought. But in return they are extremely exacting; they claim him altogether, are jealous of his interest in others,

⁴⁴⁷ Jules Falret *Études cliniques sur les maladies mentales et nerveuse* (Paris, 1890), p. 502.

⁴⁴⁸ For a discussion of how Charcot's performances influenced French theatre, and of how they continue to do so today, see Showalter (1997), pp. 100-112.

make constant calls upon him, want him to stay with them, and take it really to heart if he shows the least indifference.”⁴⁴⁹

As Janet’s quotation attests, hysterical women were constructed as doctors’ blind patients and as the victims of unrequited love. They were simultaneously understood as passive and demanding, diseased and desired, unconscious and conniving. Hysterics’ obedience to doctors’ requests questions the truthfulness of hysterical symptoms: were they real signs of sickness or just a performance? Despite the seeming legibility of hysterical bodies in visual recordings, hysteria remained hard to read, the truth claims made by its representation constantly undermined by the instability of its definitions, causes and existence, as well as by the threatening subjectivity and agency of hysterical patients. Although hysterical women were blinded and controlled by the light of modern scientific medicine, the causes of hysteria remained in the dark. The more light was shone on their bodies, the more darkness was revealed.

Brouillet’s Construction of Heroic Men and Sick Women: Precedents in Paint and Photography

Brouillet’s rendering of bodies was considered by some critics to be of the utmost realism. Javel wrote that, “Les personnages qui écoutent sont posés avec une vérité d’attitude qui dénote, chez M. Brouillet, une sûreté de vision absolument remarquable.”⁴⁵⁰ Salon critics used scientific language to decipher Brouillet’s image and those depicted in it. Merson credited the science of the composition for the likeness of the figures while others discussed the physiognomy of those depicted.⁴⁵¹ Critics and viewers took pleasure in identifying those represented in the audience. Ballu went so far as to add that Brouillet’s painting “aura du succès, et il ne le devra pas seulement à l’intérêt des portraits qu’on cherchera à reconnaître.”⁴⁵² Many reviewers provided biographical details of those in the audience along with the list of those portrayed. Mantz wrote that, “Tous les visages sont des portraits, et les journaux ne se sont pas fait faute de nommer les personnages qui ont posé devant le jeune peintre.”⁴⁵³

The diversity of the men depicted by Brouillet in Charcot’s audience was one of its greatest attractions, yet this diversity did not extend to sex and class. Javel described

⁴⁴⁹ Janet *The Mental State of Hystericals* (New York, 1901), pp. 151-155.

⁴⁵⁰ Javel, n.p.

⁴⁵¹ Merson, p. 282.

⁴⁵² Ballu, n.p.

⁴⁵³ Although Mantz did discuss the portraits, he did not think they were very good.

the audience as “élite”⁴⁵⁴ and surely when Mantz wrote that, “Dans ce savant auditoire, chacun reconnaît un ami,” he was intending to address his male peers and indicate his intimacy with men of such high regard.⁴⁵⁵ Charles Darcours wrote in *Le Journal Illustré* that the painting would not only allow the audience to recognize “tous nos médecins de notorité” but would also show them how such men speak and gesticulate.⁴⁵⁶ Critics saw Charcot and his audience either as men like themselves, or as men who should be emulated. The import of these men was not only confirmed by the rendering of their suited bodies, their position within the respected medical sphere, and their portraits on display at the Salon, but also by their physiognomies. Since visible exteriors were understood to symbolize invisible interior qualities, the true-to-lifeness of representations of the body’s surface was of great importance, particularly if moral and intellectual characteristics were to be easily read. Doctor Dubray praised Brouillet’s depiction of Charcot for its accuracy:

This likeness, one can say, is true from head to foot, since it is not only the well-known face of the professor which is of an irreproachable fidelity, but also his posture, the pose of his legs, and everything about his person, which is taken from life.⁴⁵⁷

Javel also discussed Charcot’s exterior, claiming that the doctor’s physiognomy “respire l’intelligence et la bonté” and that “il est bien rare que la bonté ne soit pas le complément du génie.”⁴⁵⁸ Javel located Charcot’s moral and intellectual capabilities in Brouillet’s painted construction of the doctor’s visible exterior. In his biographical account of Charcot in *Les hommes de mon temps* of 1878, Ignotus spent a few paragraphs aligning Charcot’s physical features with moral and scientific values:

Les cheveux qu’il a tous et presque dans leur première teinte, disent la force de volonté, indiquée d’ailleurs par le nez. Il a besoin de ses cheveux pour ressembler à Bonaparte – et il ne veut pas que ses cheveux tombent, comme à nous autres, pourtant bien moins âgés que lui!

Son regard a des airs mystiques, étonnants de la part d’un matérialiste. Ce regard est oblique, - ce qui surprend dans un masque de Bonaparte. Le sommet du crâne est moins large que la partie basse de la face, ce qui veut dire que l’homme aime les jouissances matérielles.

⁴⁵⁴ Javel, n.p.

⁴⁵⁵ Mantz, n.p.

⁴⁵⁶ Darcours, p. 146.

⁴⁵⁷ Doctor Dubray, “Promenades au Salon”, *Union Médicale*, 14 May 1887, as translated in Weisberg, pp. 403-404.

⁴⁵⁸ Javel, n.p.

La bouche a ce pincement qui indique que l'homme est plus apte à la haine qu'à l'amour. Le nez est puissant et particulier. Toute la force de M. Charcot est là. Le nez romain est bien attaché et bien dessiné – c'est comme l'extrémité d'une proue de galère romaine, destinée à fendre les flots, malgré vents et marée...⁴⁵⁹

Ignotus stressed Charcot's masculinity by emphasizing his full head of hair, his greater aptitude for hate than love, his similarity to Bonaparte, his soldier-like character and his materialism – all characteristics associated with masculinity during the late-nineteenth century.⁴⁶⁰ Ignotus, like Brouillet, constructed Charcot as an ideal republican: educated, rational, strong and nationalistic. Péan and Pasteur are represented similarly in their 1887 portraits. In all three works, white haired older men symbolize intellectual over bodily strength as their wisdom is understood as equally important to the survival of France as the fit muscular physiques of young soldiers.

Although Salon critics discussed the healthy male bodies in Brouillet's canvas, it was their sick counterpart who received the most attention. Described in *Le Monde Illustré* as "la seule variété introduite dans cette vaste uniformité", the female hysteric was seen as the opposite of the male intellectual.⁴⁶¹ Wittman is depicted as Charcot's co-star in *Une leçon clinique* – light falls through the window onto her exposed chest while she swoons in the painted spotlight. Charcot's ownership over the patient is symbolized by his close proximity to her body, the painting's setting at the Salpêtrière, the compositional dominance of his body, and his active gestures in contrast to her comatose condition. The narrative of *Une leçon clinique* focuses on the relationship between Charcot and Wittman. As Javel wrote, "C'est le docteur et son sujet qui attirent et retiennent tout d'abord le regard du spectateur. Le drame est là."⁴⁶² Charcot's central role is also evident as he, like Wittman, is under the audience's gaze. Yet in contrast to Wittman, whose sex, unconscious state and stripped body constructs her in opposition to the clothed and sentient men in the audience, thus emphasizing her role as the object of study, Charcot is represented as a guiding force: the men are listening to his words, taking down notes, thus showcasing Charcot's influence over the understanding of hysteria in various disciplines.

Unlike the covered bodies of male professionals, whose black costumes, bearded faces and white cuffs and collars only allowed for the exposure of pink hands and faces,

⁴⁵⁹ Ignotus, p. 384.

⁴⁶⁰ Charcot was often aligned with Bonaparte. This is most evident in the number of profiles of the doctor that look very similar to those of the French leader.

⁴⁶¹ Merson, p. 315.

⁴⁶² Javel, n.p.

Brouillet showed the swooning body of Blanche Wittman with a bare chest, smooth shoulders and naked arms. In contrast to the high-buttoned jackets and tight ties of clothed men, Wittman's dress is pulled down, her corset is loose, and her breasts are insecurely covered by the flimsy cotton of white undergarments. Brouillet portrayed hysteria as a sickness of undress, as is also evident in many of the photographs in the *Iconographies de la Salpêtrière* where hysterical women are shown with bare shoulders and in thin cotton nightgowns (Fig. 184, 185). The removal of clothing and exposure of corsets is also depicted in the largest painted representation of hysteria that was on show at the Salpêtrière during the late nineteenth century: Tony Robert-Fleury's *Pinel Freeing the Insane* (Fig. 186).⁴⁶³

Robert-Fleury's painting, which represents Doctor Philippe Pinel watching as a man unchains hysterical women at the Salpêtrière, depicts hysterical female bodies that share many similarities to that painted by Brouillet as well as those created for the *Iconographie Photographique*. This is evident when comparing the woman shown lying on the ground in Robert-Fleury's work with a photograph of a hysterical woman in the 1875 volume (Fig. 187). In this work, a hysterical woman is represented lying on the ground of the Salpêtrière courtyard. Hysteria is portrayed as dirty, earth-bound and uncontrollable. This image also shares similarities with nineteenth-century photographic *académies*, such as G. Le Gray's *Nu dans l'atelier* of 1849, in which a naked woman with dirty feet is lying on a dusty ground (Fig. 188). All of the images are bird's eye views showing the meeting of women's bodies and dirt, hard granules digging into soft flesh. These photographs construct women as animalistic and inferior. They also show how dirty women were considered legitimate subjects for medical, artistic and pornographic representation.

Robert-Fleury chose to paint Pinel at the Salpêtrière rather than at the Bicêtre, a man's hospital, which was where he actually first unchained patients. Jane Kromm has suggested that this historical inaccuracy was made in order for the artist to depict female rather than male bodies.⁴⁶⁴ Female illness was certainly more fashionable and less feared than male illness, as male sickness provoked anxiety particularly in the face of the recent defeat in the Franco-Prussian war and the declining birth rate. Robert-Fleury's painting

⁴⁶³ Officially titled *Pinel, Médecin en chef de la Salpêtrière en 1795* in the Salon catalogue of 1876, this painting was bought by the State and hung in the main lecture hall of the Salpêtrière. Sander Gilman refers briefly to Robert-Fleury's painting in his chapter "The Image of the Hysteric", *Hysteria beyond Freud*, p. 345.

⁴⁶⁴ Jane Kromm, "'Marianne' and the Madwoman", *Art Journal*, 46, 4, Winter 1987, pp. 299-304.

corresponds to the medical books emerging from the Salpêtrière during the mid-1870s that showed hysterical women with bulging eyes, open mouths and wildly messy hair (Fig. 189, 190). Yet in Robert-Fleury's work, only the young hysterics are shown with bare chests and loosened clothing, while the older patients are fully clothed with their hair covered; hysteria is only represented as sexually alluring when it belongs to a young body.⁴⁶⁵ Brouillet's hysteric appears to be constructed out of both the standing and horizontal young hysterics that were painted by Robert-Fleury. Like Robert-Fleury's standing hysteric, Brouillet's hysteric is represented as a young woman with bare shoulders, unfastened white undergarments and unsteady feet. Like the horizontal woman, she is painted with an exposed and twisted neck, clenched fists and contorted arms. The representation of an old hysteric reaching out to the young horizontal woman in Robert-Fleury's work parallels the old nurse's gesture rendered by Brouillet and also refers back to the arched and twisted bodies in earlier religious iconography such as those mentioned in *Les Démoniaques dans l'art*. By drawing on previous art forms as well as medical iconography, Robert-Fleury's realism, like Brouillet's, is manufactured out of other realistic representations: religious, medical and artistic. The similarities between Brouillet's painting and that by Robert-Fleury suggest that Brouillet wanted to make an updated version of life at the Salpêtrière. He replaced the courtyard depicted by Robert-Fleury with a modern amphitheatre, Pinel was replaced by Charcot, and the humane act of unchaining was replaced by the medical act of hypnosis. Significantly, two themes remain in both images. Firstly, that hysteria was a female illness, and secondly, that the Salpêtrière was a modern anti-clerical space. Pinel was an active republican during the 1790s, who, like Charcot, sought to free medicine from the 'chains' of clericalism and royalism.⁴⁶⁶ There is no evidence of the church in either of these works despite the large presence of nuns and priests in the medical service.

Unlike Robert-Fleury's painting, Brouillet's was not a commissioned portrait and was never hung at the Salpêtrière. Documents show that Brouillet offered the painting to the state, who bought it for 3000 francs following the Salon.⁴⁶⁷ Charcot never purchased the work. Although some critics and historians, such as Thuillier and Signoret, have

⁴⁶⁵ Kromm claims that this is a Marianne figure because the woman is shown with dark hair, in a peasant dress and has a bare chest. Kromm, p. 300.

⁴⁶⁶ Weisberg suggests that this image is as much about the unchaining of patients as it is about medical separation from the church. Weisberg, p. 231.

⁴⁶⁷ Brouillet offered the painting to the State after the 1887 Salon. It was bought for 3000 francs and was in storage for four years before being sent to a municipal museum in Nice. See Archives National, côte F 21 2059.

suggested that Gérôme, Brouillet's teacher, spoke to Charcot about having his young student paint the scene, and further claimed that Charcot had an active role in deciding what and who was painted in Brouillet's work, no documents exist to support this claim nor are there any records of Charcot's views of the work. Although it is likely that a photographic reproduction of the painting was on display at the Salpêtrière, when it appeared is unknown. Interestingly, it was the print of the painting that helped popularize the work despite its lack of public viewing. Freud famously kept a copy in his office throughout his lifetime (Fig. 191).

Representations of unclothed women next to clothed men were commonly used in Salon painting, be it in images of artists with their models, doctors with patients, or owners with slaves. Such narratives produced power differences between clothed and unclothed, particularly since the naked body was usually female. Brouillet's portrayal of a Salpêtrière hysteric is similar to his teacher Gérôme's painting of a female slave in *The Slave Auction*: both women are represented as exotic, available and under the control of clothed male bodies (Fig. 192).⁴⁶⁸ In both paintings, women are represented with blocked vision and exposed flesh, and their bodies are displayed on stages before all male audiences. Yet Brouillet transformed Gérôme's representation of an idealized nude body into an image of a modern *Parisienne*. Wittman is represented in contemporary dress and contemporary scene, and is shown as subject to modern scientific experimentation. She is shown as malleable material in artistic and medical hands. In contrast to the orientalist scene, the medical theme did not allow for the full exposure of an idealized 'oriental' femininity, as exemplified by Gérôme. It had to appear rational and therefore different from the sexed fantasy world of the East created by artists such as Gérôme. Yet both depilated 'oriental' female figures and hysterical and hypnotized female bodies were understood as modern spectacles: both were on display at exhibition venues in Paris, such as the Exposition Universelles and wax museums.⁴⁶⁹ The 'otherness' of the foreign body was aligned with that of the diseased body as both were positioned in opposition to the healthy bodies of white men and as needing the intervention of Western science. As is

⁴⁶⁸ The connection between these two paintings has also been made by Thulilier, pp. 225-226, and Signoret, p. 690.

⁴⁶⁹ In his discussion of spectacle and modern culture, Jonathan Crary draws connections between the spectacle of colonized people on display at the Universelle Exposition of 1889 and the display of hypnotized bodies at the First International Congress on Hypnosis, which was occurring simultaneously. He points out that both were linked by their understood connections to child-like and regressive states, which were seen as fundamentally opposed to Western rationalism. Crary (1999), pp. 230-236.

evident in Gsell's 1887 portrait of Pasteur, foreign bodies, particularly those from the French colonies in North Africa, were understood as bodies in need of saving.

Brouillet's work demanded the representation of a hysterical body that was visibly sick because the legibility of the patient's illness was integral to the painting's narrative and to the identity of the professional men depicted. Yet his desire to get noticed at the Salon demanded that he represent hysteria as sensational and sensuous. Nonetheless, the body could not be shown as too sick or too naked (it could not assault bourgeois taste) and therefore Brouillet did not show the woman fully undressed, as Charcot often saw patients, nor did he create a nude or idealized Odalisque. Rather, his work fluctuates between the real and the ideal, the rational and the spectacular. This fluctuation in realist representations of women in medical contexts is also present in Gervex's painting, in which the artist was faced with the problem of how to represent a sick female body realistically while simultaneously making it pleasurable, and suitable, for Salon audiences.

For contemporary critics, the dishevelled attire of the hysteric in Brouillet's painting symbolized a female body out of control, falling outside of the rigid structures of proper femininity, while the male bodies represented knowledge and health. Unlike the women represented in Gsell's 1887 portrait of Pasteur, in which female figures are shown in the scientific arena as mothers who turn to science as a means to raise healthy families, the woman in Brouillet's canvas is depicted as a hysteric in need of saving. Identified by Salon critics as a hysteric, "une névrose", "une cataleptic", this woman was simultaneously described as being hypnotized, in a "crispation nerveuse", and as going through a phase of the *grand attaque hystérique*. Critics' descriptions of Wittman's body reveal a fluency with the medicalized language of hysteria and the ways in which this internal disease was believed to manifest itself upon the body's exterior. Nineteenth-century viewers saw hysteria and hypnosis in the woman's state of undress, by the arch of her back, the flexing of her wrists and the turn of her ankle - poses that were familiar to them because of their representation in nineteenth-century literature, photography, popular medical journals as well as in Charcot and Richer's *Les Démoniaques dans l'art*. In *Une leçon clinique*, Brouillet fixed multiple characteristics of hysteria onto one body. Rather than show hysteria in a single pose or gesture, or as belonging to various bodies - male or female, rich or poor, thin or obese - Brouillet located the illness on the body of the young woman, Blanche Wittman, star hysteric.

Wittman occupies a central position in Charcot's studies. She was the patient most discussed and photographed in the 1879 volume of the *Iconographie photographique*. In this book, hysterical women are photographed in various stages of attacks while the accompanying text describes their symptoms and treatments. As is evident in figures one to ten, and figures thirty-three to thirty-five, Wittman was photographed in multiple hysterical states and undergoing various experiments. She was shown in an *état normal*, conservatively dressed and manicured, as well as dishevelled, asleep, and in an *arc en cercle* (Fig. 193, 194, 195, 196). Looking through the photographs of Wittman, visual similarities between her and Brouillet's hysteric become apparent, as is evident by her twisted hand, exposed chest, falling body and representation as a Salpêtrière *vedette*.

The obvious visual ties between Brouillet's painting and these medical photographs helped construct *Une leçon clinique* as documentary and accurate. Yet the face of Brouillet's hysteric is more beautiful than that of the photographed Wittman, her body more trim, thus exposing the ways in which Brouillet adjusted reality, adding to and omitting from it, in order to produce a rendition of hysteria that satisfied conventional definitions of beauty, was deemed suitable for a Salon painting yet could nonetheless be categorized as a truthful recording of modern medical life. Brouillet imbued his hysterical woman with the sense of the real through its juxtaposition with his rendition of Richer's drawing on the back wall. Unlike Brouillet's representation of Richer's drawing, which appears simple and monochromatic, Brouillet's Wittman is meticulously detailed, modelled and coloured. Although the inclusion of Richer's drawing symbolizes Brouillet's knowledge of medicine, it also suggests that his painting has a greater claim to reality than Richer's simple line drawing.

When examining Brouillet's depiction of the hysteric in comparison to that of the men in the painting, it is evident that Brouillet spent more time and effort painting Wittman: he has painted her with a smooth surface and detailed clothing, light and shadow play across her bare chest, and her expressive features are meticulously observed. In contrast, the male figures appear one-dimensional and stiff, and the paint that creates their skin is rough and flat. Despite the recognizable portraits of many of the men, other men become mere types, their beards, suits and roughly painted features erasing all signs of individuality. Perhaps men, as creators and cataloguers of images, did not require the realistic rendering that sick female bodies demanded, or perhaps Brouillet did not want to

spend his time ‘touching them up’. Ollendorf’s review makes reference to the criticism that Brouillet received for his depiction of the audience. Ollendorf wrote that, “...ce ne sont pas des personnages vivants et habillés que nous avons devant nous: ce sont des vêtements enveloppant des formes étrangères à l’anatomie et rapproches parentes des mannequins de l’atelier.”⁴⁷⁰ Realism was considered an essential element of portraiture, yet it was in the likeness of the portraits that Brouillet failed. In contrast to his sketchy depictions of professional men, his portrayal of Wittman demonstrates the time and effort required to produce a life-like image. His depiction of her body reveals a knowledge of anatomy and attention to detail that was not extended to his rendering of healthy men. Brouillet’s representation of Wittman not only illustrates his own desire to create a credible representation of a hysterical female body, but also shows the nineteenth-century necessity to portray the hysterical body realistically. Realism was used as a means to understand, contain and control the unruly and disorderly bodies of hysterical women.

Brouillet’s inability to create portraits of the male audience that were considered real enough by some critics was also attributed to the belief that the painting was rushed. Mantz wrote that:

Nous devons dire toutefois que M. Brouillet, pressé sans doute par la fatalité des dates, ne semble pas avoir eu la possibilité et le loisir d’étudier à fond la physionomie particulière de ses modèles. Quelques-uns ne sont pas d’une ressemblance bien avérée...Parfois le pinceau a couru trop vite, et mon sentiment est que certains portraits, ceux auxquels s’intéressa l’avenir, devraient être repris et soulignés par quelques accents plus vrais.⁴⁷¹

Ollendorf and Merson agreed that Brouillet had rushed to finish the painting. The painting was criticized for its inability to fulfil its intended realism. Despite the realism invoked by the painting’s narrative and detailed rendering of the hysteric’s body and daylight, the sense of urgency produced by the hurried portraits of the audience belied the careful and documentary recording associated with realist practice. Realism was needed if the painting was to stand as a historical document for future viewers. Although realism was the style of choice for the creation of portraits of medical men, and realism was considered as the visual language of medicine and history, particularly with the emergence of photography, the limitations of different mediums affected the perceived realism of the objects produced. Realism in paint, it was thought, was limited by the

⁴⁷⁰ Ollendorf, pp. 63-64.

⁴⁷¹ Mantz, n.p.

human hand and therefore could not provide the accurate and quick representations of visible reality that were produced by a camera.

The desire for painting to be quick, contemporary and realistic exposes the conflicts between the demands of realism in paint and the immediacy provided by photography. Unlike the comparatively quick click of the camera, painterly realism was time consuming. The smooth surface of the photograph appeared to erase all signs of human interaction, creating an 'objective' recording. In contrast, Brouillet's realism in paint required hours of touching to create a similar sense of detachment. Brouillet could never entirely erase his touch. The strokes of his brush were understood as obvious signs of his bodily involvement and subjectivity. Although these signs of subjectivity helped construct the image as a realist document because they indicated his status as witness, they also exhibited a subjectivity that was not considered to exist in photography. As Mantz' criticism attests, the painting's inability to be a worthy historical document for the future was caused by Brouillet's failure to provide the painting with "accents plus vrais."⁴⁷²

Brouillet turned to photography in order to imbue his painting with a greater sense of the real as the study of photography came to be equated with the study of real life. He painted part of *Une leçon clinique* based on photographs taken at the Salpêtrière rather than rely solely on life experience. As Ollendorf suggested:

Le fond de la toile et toute la partie gauche sont remplis par des personnages si bien groupés, qu'on croirait que l'artiste, passant un jour dans la salle de l'illustre praticien, a quitté l'hôpital emportant avec lui une précieuse photographie instantanée due sans doute à la bienveillance de l'habile chef des travaux artistiques de la Salpêtrière.⁴⁷³

That Brouillet used photographs to paint *Une leçon clinique* was confirmed by Fernand Levillain, who wrote that, "L'artiste a copié sans modifications l'épreuve qu'avait faite M. Londe, l'habile directeur du service photographique de la Salpêtrière..."⁴⁷⁴ Levillain substantiated this claim by including Londe's photograph of Charcot that Brouillet used for *Une leçon clinique* along with his article (Fig. 197). Although Brouillet's use of photographs was praised, his painting's similarity to photography was also considered one of its downfalls. Critics commented that the painting was flat and bland. Charles Ponsonhaille wrote in *L'Artiste* that, "*Une leçon clinique à la Salpêtrière* m'est gâtée par

⁴⁷² Mantz, n.p.

⁴⁷³ Ollendorf, p. 63.

⁴⁷⁴ Fernand Levillain, "Charcot et l'école de la Salpêtrière", *Revue Encyclopédique*, 78, 4, March 1891, p. 113.

sa ressemblance avec une grande photographie peinte, la composition est mediocre, beaucoup de personnages sont collés les uns aux autres.”⁴⁷⁵ The contradictory attitudes of critics toward photography reflect broader nineteenth-century debates surrounding the status of photography. Similar comments had been made about Bonnat’s portrait of Pasteur in 1886. Although the realistic details, smooth surface and exactness of photography was certainly commendable, not all of photography’s characteristics were considered desirable in paint.

Photography at the Salpêtrière: Scientific Pictures and Procedures

In 1882, Gaston Tissandier dedicated a whole chapter of his book *La Photographie* to the relationship between art and photography, outlining the different roles of artists and photographers as well as offering artists ways in which they could use photography to their own benefit. Significantly, Tissandier believed that a partnership between painter and physician would raise the status of photography to art. He wrote, “Mais on ne peut nier que l’appareil photographique manoeuvré par un opérateur ayant tout à la fois l’adresse du physicien et le goût du peintre, donne naissance à des épreuves marquées au sceau de l’art.”⁴⁷⁶ Photography was a meeting place for art and medicine as medical and art students both used photographs to improve their skills and knowledge of the human body.

The use of photographs in the production of painting was not uncommon. Known as *académies*, these photographs, which typically showed naked male and female models in classical poses, provided artists with a human body when living models were not available or affordable.⁴⁷⁷ Despite the classical poses of the bodies in *academies*, these photographs were of real bodies on display, complete with pubic hair and fuzzy armpits. As is evident when comparing Nadar’s *Étude de nu pour J.-L. Gérôme* of 1860-61 with Gérôme’s female slave in his painting, *The Slave Auction*, the photographed female body was transformed by Gérôme into an idealized nude by depicting the female body as hairless, smooth and pale (Fig. 198). Yet there is no evidence that Brouillet turned to these *academies* when he painted *Une leçon clinique*. Rather, it appears that he used medical photographs in order to further imbue his work with the sense of the real.

⁴⁷⁵ Charles Ponsonhailhe, “Le Salon”, *L’Artiste*, July 1887, pp. 48-49.

⁴⁷⁶ Gaston Tissandier, *La Photographie* (Paris, 1882), p. 523.

⁴⁷⁷ For various accounts of *académies* and their uses, see Sylvie Aubena, et al., *L’art du nu au XIXe siècle: le photographe et son modèle*, exh.cat. Bibliothèque nationale de France François-Mitterrand (Paris, 1997).

In 1882, Charcot appointed Albert Londe to head the Salpêtrière photography department. This not only secured the key role of photography in the study of hysteria but also made the hospital a prominent site of photographic advances, as Londe was an avid participant in the development of new photographic techniques and apparatuses.⁴⁷⁸ He was not a doctor but was an active leader in the newly formed society of amateur photographers as well as an organizer of the International Photography Conference held in 1889 in Paris. Londe wrote numerous books on photography and his photographs were published not only in connection with the Salpêtrière, but were also printed in his joint 1895 publication with Paul Richer, *Atlas de physiologie artistique* and were shown at photographic exhibitions. Londe's role in creating new photographic technologies, particularly his invention of *l'appareil à douze objectifs*, furthered both medical and artistic investigations of the body, particularly when Richer, who took over from Mathias Duval as chair of anatomy at the École des Beaux-Arts, introduced these new photographic processes and results to the art school.⁴⁷⁹

Photography appeared to offer a universal language of truth that appealed to nineteenth-century positivists.⁴⁸⁰ The conscious desire for photography to be scientific and universal was expressed by M. Janssen in his opening remarks at the 1889 *Congrès International de Photographie* in Paris when he claimed that:

Messieurs, l'art photographique, malgré...l'admirable ensemble de methodes dont il s'est enrichi, attend encore ses bases scientifiques. Aussi devons-nous nous efforcer de lui donner et de lui faire prendre son rang parmi les sciences.⁴⁸¹

The integration of photography into the Parisian hospital system attests to the import and legitimacy medical practitioners gave to photography and its role in the scientific arena.⁴⁸² This role was further emphasized in books and at conferences held on the topic. Burais' 1896 doctoral thesis on the medical applications of photography outlines the "perfection" of photography over other media, as photography's ability to produce detailed and

⁴⁷⁸ For a history of Londe's technological contributions to photography, see Denis Bernard and André Gunthert, *L'instant rêve: Albert Londe* (Nîmes, 1993).

⁴⁷⁹ For interesting studies on the relationship between art, science and photography, and the influence of Londe and Richer on this work, see section "Mutations de l'académie par la photographie scientifique" in *L'art du nu au XIXe siècle*, pp. 152-183.

⁴⁸⁰ Alan Sekula points out that photography appeared to fulfill the Enlightenment desire for a universal language. He justly argues that the mimetic language of the camera provided a "truth that could be uttered in the universal abstract language of mathematics." Alan Sekula, "The Body and the Archive" in Richard Bolton (ed), *The Contest of Meaning* (Massachusetts, 1989), p.352.

⁴⁸¹ M. Janssen, *Congrès International de Photographie* (Paris, 1889), p. 6.

⁴⁸² Importantly, the legitimacy of photography as a method of documentation was enhanced by its use by the Parisian police.

exacting images allowed diagnoses to be made simply by viewing a photograph rather than the patient. He wrote:

La Photographie permet de simplifier les choses. Entre des mains expérimentées, la reproduction photographique arrive à être d'une perfection si grande que, dans nombre de cas, le diagnostic s'impose à la vue de l'épreuve, et qu'une notice de quelques lignes accompagnant la planche suffit où quatre pages de texte pénible à lire n'eussent donné qu'une idée approximative de ce que l'auteur voulait décrire.⁴⁸³

Burais's text shows the ways in which the realistic details provided by photography allowed the photograph to stand in for the body of the patient, as photographic realism came to be seen as more 'real' than the human body. Similarly to wax models, the examination of medical photographs did not depend on the availability of patients nor was it confined by social restrictions on viewing naked bodies. Burais' text also stresses the relationship between the visual and textual in medical diagnosis. Although photography was seen to speed up diagnosis because the visual details provided by photography were believed to be more easily and rapidly understood than pages of detailed medical writing, medical images were nonetheless always tied to explanatory texts. Photographs were used to illustrate, and their literalness was praised and understood as necessary for their use (unlike Salon paintings where literal realism was criticized by French critics and regarded as a negative trait typical of nineteenth-century English paintings).⁴⁸⁴ Text could fill in the details that photography lacked as text made sure that the viewer knew the signs and symptoms of diseases and to which bodies they belonged. Text clarified and explained that which a photograph could not. Similarly, photography stood in when textual analysis was not enough, or when it was too time consuming. It allowed for easy comparisons and aided with teaching in a way that solitary reading could not.

The competing claims of different realist methods and mediums, as well as their varying abilities to represent the real, are evident in the volumes of the *Iconographies photographique*, where photographs, texts, drawings, etchings and charts work together to create realistic representations of hysteria. Each book deals with different elements of hysteria and relies upon different modes of recording the hysterical body, even though photography is highlighted in all. The photographs in the *Iconographies photographique*

⁴⁸³ Burais, p. 2.

⁴⁸⁴ French critics described James Tissot's realism as literal and "English". For a brief account of the traits of English realism from a French perspective, see Larousse, p. 754.

hold a prominent place in twentieth-century discussions of hysteria, particularly the images of Augustine that are found in the 1878 edition (Fig. 199, 200, 201). As many twentieth-century scholars, such as Charles Bernheimer, Didi-Huberman and Janet Beizer, justly argue, the photographs of Augustine are highly sexed, contrived images that exhibit a scantily clad female body posed for visual consumption. Yet these photographs of Augustine should not be unquestionably accepted as the norm or as the visual foundation for studies on the iconography of hysteria. Although they are the most easily accessible to scholars, as they are the most reproduced images, these photographs must be studied in relation to the plethora of images and objects created and on show at the Salpêtrière and in other Salpêtrière books as all are products of the same historical moment and institution, and must be read in relation to the other images and accompanying texts. Significantly, the history of hysteria, particularly since 1980, has overlooked many of the photographs in the first volume. These photographs are primarily of older unattractive women. Many of the photographs are blurred, the faces are hard to read, and the movements of the patients ‘ruin’ the photographs by producing grey blurred patches (Fig. 202, 203). Some of these pictures were taken outdoors or in a hospital room rather than a purpose built studio where lighting could be controlled (Fig. 204). When comparing these earlier photos with those of Augustine, it becomes apparent that the staged and still poses of hysterics in the later volumes fixed the technical photographic problems produced by a moving and agitated patient. Although there are many photos of Augustine, the volumes are filled with women of varying ages, sizes and with different physical abnormalities. While many of the photographs in all volumes show women in nightgowns and tangled in sheets, other photographs are of fully-clothed women with shrunk and twisted arms and hands, women with crippling physical deformities, an obese woman with her hair pulled tightly back, and a young girl with blank eyes (Fig. 205, 206, 207, 208). The photographs in the first volume of the *Iconographies* are unlike those that were sensationalized in the press and in Brouillet’s painting, where hysteria was located on young and beautiful female bodies. These representations of sick women were not suitable for a Salon audience, where women’s bodies and female sexuality were usually shown as young, pleasing and alluring. The photographs in the later volume are similar to Brouillet’s creation because they appear to fluctuate between the sick and the sensational. Augustine’s sexy stare and long flowing hair in the photos make her appear as a seductress rather than sick patient.

The variety of women portrayed in Salpêtrière iconography contributed to the scientific character of the photographic project at the Salpêtrière. The photographs were simultaneously a scientific experimentation on women, a record of this experimentation, as well as representations of different forms of hysteria. Although the texts described how hysteria could ‘infect’ all types of people, the photographs were exclusively of people from the lower classes. These images classified specific hysterical symptoms to aid with teaching and studying but they also visually constructed hysteria as a lower-class disease. Although upper-class women did visit Charcot as private patients, they would not have been photographed. Like the wax models at Saint-Louis, the photographs from the Salpêtrière show how medical representations produced and reinforced the belief that madness and sexually transmitted diseases did not infect the bourgeoisie and upper classes. The photographs were not created as portraits of individual sitters but were representations of specimens and diseases. The creation of portraits at the Salpêtrière also became a joke played on sick women by medical men. The promise of having a portrait taken was used as a lure to get hysterical women into the photographic studio, as is evident in Londe’s comments in *La photographie médicale*: “Les hystériques ont été amenées devant l’appareil sous le prétexte de faire faire leur portrait. A ce moment, un coup de gong a été donné et elles sont toutes tombées en catalepsie...”⁴⁸⁵ As Londe’s statement attests, having one’s portrait taken was a desirable event yet it was this representational genre that the medical community denied the hysterical patient. Unlike portraiture, which was used to create stable and flattering images of medical professionals for display at the Salons, these photographic images degraded patients as they were forced to put their diseases on show.

In photography and text, the 1879 volume describes and illustrates the transformation of bodies into hysterical states as well as the medical processes through which bodies were made to transform. The first photograph represents Wittman in a three-quarter pose with her seated body turned slightly away from the camera (Fig. 193). She is fully clothed, wearing a chequered-print shirt neatly tucked into her dark skirt, and a knitted shawl is primly wrapped around her shoulders and secured with a pin. Her blond hair is meticulously arranged, as is evident by her straight middle parting, the evenly manicured curly fringe on her forehead, and the orderly sections of hair twisted and fastened on her head. Shown with demure dangling earrings and a closed-mouth

⁴⁸⁵ Londe (1892), p. 90.

smile, this photograph portrays Wittman as a well-mannered and composed working-class woman. The photograph's composition, the sitter's conventional pose, and the flattering frontal light source, that softens and displays Wittman's facial features, construct the photograph as a portrait, as it is visually similar to the thousands of portraits taken in the newly affordable photographic studios in Paris. Yet, as is indicated by the text below the photograph, this picture represents Wittman in an "état normal." The text changes the portrait into a visual example for a medical taxonomy of hysteria. The photograph's function was to show Wittman before the onslaught of a hysterical attack and was to serve as the healthy template from which all other representations of her sick body were to be compared. The photographs that follow show Wittman in, amongst other poses, a *délire érotique*, a *hyperexcitabilité musculaire* and an *attitude provoquée* (Fig. 209, 210, 211). The photographs mimic the poses drawn by Richer of Charcot's conception of the different stages of a hysterical attack, and, as previously discussed, are similar iconographically to those of saints and the sick in earlier art.

The conventions of portraiture, which contributed to Wittman's representation as a pruned and proper working-class woman in the first image, helped situate her body in the realm of female health and normalcy, thus showing how representational practices from the artistic sphere infiltrated medical iconography in order to fulfil the demands of modern scientific medicine. Portraiture indicated health as much as it did wealth and social status. Yet the photograph's accompanying text and position in a medical book undermine the possibility of its status as portraiture. In the *Iconographie photographique*, Wittman's body is shown as the object of scientific medicine and as a sick body in need of study and curing rather than as an individual whose personal attributes and status are on show. Despite the image's visual similarities to photographic portraiture, this photograph of Wittman is intrinsically tied to its medical context - it cannot be removed from its place in a medical book, nor can it be read independently from the text below it or from the descriptive paragraphs that describe Wittman in the pages before and after the photograph, or from the numerous other photographs of Wittman that appear throughout the book. It is not an isolated portrait, framed and on show, like those of Pasteur, Péan and Charcot at the Salon. Situated between the pages of highly descriptive medical prose, and only pages away from other photographs, charts and drawings of hysterical women, the photograph of Wittman in an *état normale* is intertwined with these other representations of hysteria. While the photograph of

Wittman is a singular representation of hysteria, it also functions as a piece of a puzzle, providing one visual example that is to be examined, tested and understood in its relationship to the other realistic rendings of hysteria that make up the book.

Although the numerous photos of Blanche attest to her popularity as a medical specimen at the Salpêtrière, the associated texts reveal an obsession with the documentation and control of her body. As if the photographic records were not detailed enough, the text also attempts to produce a representation of her every inch:

W...est grande (1m ,64)...elle est blonde, avec un teint lymphatique. La peau est blanche. Les seins sont très volumineux...Son intelligence atteint à peine la moyenne. La mémoire est assez bonne...Son regard est brillant: la vue et le contact des hommes produisent chez elle une espèce d'excitation particulière.⁴⁸⁶

Wittman's attacks were defined, timed and monitored, her words and personal history recorded, her taste, sight, vaginal secretions and vomit studied. Her treatments were documented: Wittman was given ether, chloroform, ovarian compressions, nitrite amyl and she was hypnotized, electrocuted, and written upon with needles. Such experiments were justified not only by their use in the medical realm, but also by the suggestion that Wittman was excited by medical male attention.

The Salpêtrière books reveal an obsession with hysterical female bodies as doctors meticulously observed and experimented on hysterical patients, particularly focusing on the *grand hystérie* and the progression of a hysterical attack towards the *arc en cercle*. Although photography helped construct the Salpêtrière project as documentary, the iconographic concentration on visual representations of the *grand hystérie* contradicts the textual representations that present a different picture of reality at the hospital. As is evident by the Salpêtrière textual records, few patients qualified as *grand hystériques* and only a few bodies were believed to hit the hysterical climax. The large number of photographs and drawings of this state belie the textual accounts produced in Charcot's numerous books and suggest that the focus on the most visually sexed images of hysteria fulfilled the personal desires of medical men, particularly Charcot, who conceived of this specific pathological state. It also points to how these images exceeded the requirements of professional duty and medical representation. This is not to suggest that textual examples were void of sexual content. Text could describe what would be considered obscene in photography: defecating, urinating and masturbating. Although medical photography allowed for the representation of naked

⁴⁸⁶ Bourneville and Régner (1879), p. 7.

and unconscious female bodies in orgasmic poses under the guise of scientific respectability, there were restrictions because medical photography could easily slip into the world of pornography. Such an example shows the ways in which realism, whether textual or visual, was dependent on social expectations and allowances as some forms of realism were given more leeway than others.

The books emerging from the Salpêtrière and those produced by the hospital's doctors are filled with multiple and varying realistic representations of hysteria. Explanatory texts, accounts of experimental procedures, photographs, prints, charts and drawings construct hysteria as a disease that required documentation through all available means. The books contain accounts of what hysterical bodies did, how bodies were diagnosed as hysterical, how hysterical bodies were tamed and cured, and how bodies reacted to medical experimentation. They provide historical records of how the hysterical body was shown, be it photographed, drawn, cast, electrified, drugged, and/or hypnotized. Significantly, the process of creating realistic representations of hysteria was considered as important as the final products. By documenting these procedures, medical professionals constructed the act of producing visual records as rational and scientific pursuits. Creating visual representations contributed to the scientific identity of the Salpêtrière as a leading hospital in Paris because such procedures were understood to produce a visible taxonomy of hysteria that contributed to medical knowledge and were also believed to advance photographic technology, which was also understood as a scientific endeavour.

The 'medical' subject of the Salpêtrière photographs of women, their creation within the hospital milieu and their publication in medical books appeared to rid these images of the implicit sexual pleasure derived from photographs of semi-naked women. Yet unlike *academies*, which straddled the border of photographic pornography, medical photographs were understood to exist within the realm of science rather than pleasure, as their purpose was believed to be the promotion and acquisition of knowledge. As Erin O'Connor has convincingly argued, medical photography has largely been written out of the standard histories of photography because it is most often considered as a clinical tool rather than aesthetic specimen.⁴⁸⁷ There is no doubt that many nineteenth-century physicians celebrated the "garanties de véracité inhérentes à la photographie", as Bourneville described photography in his preface to the 1878 volume of *Iconographie*

⁴⁸⁷ For a focused discussion of medical photography, see Erin O'Connor, "Camera Medica: Towards a Morbid History of Photography", *History of Photography*, Autumn 1999, 23, 3, pp. 232-244.

photographique.⁴⁸⁸ Yet, as O'Connor justly claims, clinical photographs cannot simply be understood as "misguided attempts at an obviously impossible objectivity."⁴⁸⁹ Rather, medical photography needs to be considered in relation to other photographic forms, as photography's history and conceptual foundation is linked to the early clinical uses of the camera, as exemplified by Londe, who was both a photographic forerunner and a medical photographer at the Salpêtrière. The distinction between medical photography as objective and documentary and that of art photography as aesthetically based is what O'Connor calls a "rationalizing fiction." Medical photography should be considered as its own genre, with its own formal problems and uniqueness, as well as with a continued relationship with artistic conventions, such as portraiture, still life and the nude.⁴⁹⁰ Although the photographs taken at the Salpêtrière share formal qualities with artistic genres, particularly portraiture and the nude, and their representations of bodies reveal shared cultural beliefs about women and sickness, the images at the Salpêtrière should not be considered as generic or typical of nineteenth-century photography nor as quintessential representations of hysteria. As Carol Armstrong argues in her critique of Didi-Huberman's reading of the pictures, the Salpêtrière photographs are eccentric, "bad" photographs that do not fit easily within the canon of the history of photography.⁴⁹¹ The blurred and grainy Salpêtrière photographs look messy and distorted when compared with the sharp focus and proper exposure of photographs made in professional studios during the nineteenth century. Yet medical photography's claim to representing reality accurately was relatively unharmed by its lack of focus, its grainy texture and its black and white surface, while abstraction in paint appeared to reinforce the artist's subjectivity, and distance the image from reality.

Frenzied Realisms: Competing Claims to Truth

Paintings, drawings, prints and photographs were used interchangeably at the Salpêtrière. As Didi-Huberman shows, photographs were drawn on, etchings were made after photographs and photographs after paintings. Didi-Huberman's investigation of Richer's drawing of a hysteric in the tetanism phase in *Etudes Cliniques* of 1881 reveals how it was based on an earlier photograph taken by Régnard for the *Iconographie photographique* of 1878 (Fig. 212, 213). In Richer's drawing, the hysterical body is more

⁴⁸⁸ Bourneville and Régnard (1878), p. II.

⁴⁸⁹ O'Connor, pp. 232-233.

⁴⁹⁰ O'Connor, pp. 237-238.

⁴⁹¹ Armstrong (2003).

expressive, the white sheets covering the patient in the photograph are removed to reveal naked and twisted legs, the foam dripping from her mouth is more pronounced, and the restraining belt is removed.⁴⁹² Such alterations allowed Richer to make hysteria more visible, more expressive and more obvious. Richer's turn away from photography reveals an instance in which photography was not able to provide enough, or the right, details. Despite its documentary and precise character, photography failed to draw out the symptoms of hysteria Richer wished to expose. Furthermore, photography could not construct the reality he wished to show. The problems with photography are also evident when comparing the images in the 1875 with those in the 1877 book. The 1877 edition contains reprinted photographs from 1875 but they have been darkened and adjusted to produce clearer images (Fig. 214, 215).

There are drawings in these books that appear to undermine the realism demanded by medical professionals and symbolized by photography such as the drawing of a woman in an attack, reproduced in both the 1877 *Iconographie photographique* and the first volume of Charcot's *Oeuvres Complètes*. This work is very cartoon like and drawn out of proportion as the woman is shown with exaggerated and monstrous facial features (Fig. 216). Although some of the drawings are more like caricatures than realistic depictions of bodies, the desire for representing the real is nonetheless evident by the simple lines surrounding the figure that were used in order to create a sense of movement. Although the rough sketches and cartoon-like images seem to be the antithesis of photographic representations, their context in a medical book and their relationship to other realistic images secured their position as relevant for medical study. Furthermore, there was an established link between photography and drawing in these books. That photography (referred to in the books as *planches*) and drawings (*figures*) were both believed to be needed in order to provide exact recordings is evident when Bourneville and Régnaud claimed:

Les attaques, dans ce cas, offrent des formes assez nombreuses et qu'il serait bien difficile de décrire clairement et d'une manière très exacte, si nous nous aidions des figures et des planches. Bien que les unes et les autres soient en partie connues, nous les produirons afin de mieux réaliser le but que nous poursuivons, à savoir la représentation fidèle des différentes phases des attaques convulsives.⁴⁹³

Although some realistic representations were considered better than others for certain tasks, they were seen to work together, each performing a certain role. While it may

⁴⁹² Didi-Huberman (2003), p. 126.

⁴⁹³ Bourneville and Régnaud (1877), pp. 16-17.

seem ridiculous to assume that these rough drawings were considered realistic, I would argue that the evidence of the doctor/artist's hand in these works exposed and attested to a doctor's first hand experience of hysteria and his celebrated role in its diagnosis and documentation; subjectivity was also an essential part of realism, particularly in terms of one being a witness to events. These images show how caricature was deemed the best method for scientific recording despite its association with exaggeration and humour because it highlighted the hand of the specialist. Richer's identity as a good doctor was compounded by his ability to draw. These drawings were regarded as contributing to the accuracy of hysteria's representation, filling in the details that photography was unable to provide. The exaggerated and fluid character of the drawings mimicked the spectacular and overstated symptoms of hysteria, producing images that portrayed the 'feeling' of hysteria in a way that photography could not. Movement in photography created blurred images as quickly changing facial expressions and rapidly moving limbs were unreadable. Furthermore, many hysterical poses, such as the infrequent *arc en cercle*, would have been hard to catch and therefore needed to either be staged for photography or reproduced by hand from memory or experience.

Representations of hysterical hands further reveal the medical fixation on the hysterical body and the unceasing focus on its representation, study and fragmentation. The first half of the photographs and drawings in the 1878 volume of *Iconographie photographique* are of women with hands in hysterical fists, their arms and wrists deformed and bent (Fig. 217, 218, 219). Richer's drawings, engravings, and plaster casts of hysterical hands are also evidence of this focus (Fig. 220, 221). Representations of hysterical hands stood in as representations of the whole hysterical body, as is evident in Richer's drawing that has the inscription, "*Mme. Boam, 37, avenue de Vaugirard*" (Fig. 222). Despite naming the patient and noting her address, Richer does not depict the patient's face or other signs of individuality. Rather, the woman is represented simply as a fragmented clothed torso, a detailed arm and a hand in a rigid contracture. Brouillet also used this potent symbol of hysteria by showing Wittman with a turned wrist and clamped fist. The hand was a symbol of illness that allowed for an attractive body – there was no drooling, no open eyelids revealing upturned eyeballs and no tongue hanging out. Hands also served an artistic function when they appeared diseased, as is evident in an *académie* by Marconi from around 1870, in which a woman is shown with a twisted hand and awkwardly positioned fingers pressed against her bare chest (Fig. 223). Nineteenth-

century criminology also focused on hands. Fingerprints were taken so that identities could not be hidden. Hands of different classes and professions were photographed and compared to one another, as is evident in Londe's photographs of workers hands reproduced in *Photographie Médicale* in 1893 (Fig. 224). Hands were believed to stand in for the whole body and to signify invisible inner qualities, such as morality and intellect. The hysterical hand was understood as a symbol of ignorance and stupidity.

Pierre Janet wrote that:

The hysteric person who paralyzes her hand seems not to know that the immobility of her fingers is due in reality to a muscular disturbance in her forearm. She stops her anaesthesia at the wrist, as would the vulgar, who, in their ignorance, say that if the hand does not move it is because the hand is diseased.⁴⁹⁴

In contrast to the skilled hands of doctors, hysterical hands were unable to touch, manipulate or feel. The hysteric was denied touch and sight – the two senses essential for the study of medicine - while doctors' senses were made acute for documentation and the acquisition of knowledge.

Didi-Huberman justly points out how the immobile state of the hysterical hand, or “dead hand” and “*mortmain*” as he calls it, not only stood in as the ultimate gesticulation of the hysterical body but also provided the material for waxes, photographs and drawings. Didi-Huberman argues that tetanism was a ‘godsend’ for the doctors at the Salpêtrière as it literally froze the body part, allowing it to be photographed without blurred results, examined easily and set into a plaster without difficulty.⁴⁹⁵ The stationary contortion of the hand allowed the hysterical body to be captured and fixed into a realistic representation— such representations could preserve a pathological moment by freezing the hysterical body in its ill state. No medium did this better than casting.

Casting, like photography, was able to produce an indexical mould of the body, making the resulting representation appear as an impartial recording. Like photography, casting was a process that was used for the construction of both commonalities and rarities. The Salpêtrière casts, like the photographs and wax models made at Saint-Louis, were made to create a visible taxonomy, to be studied, to show generalities and differences, and to help with diagnoses. The casts of hysterical bodies were believed to prove the presence and existence not only of the hysterical bodies themselves but also of hysteria as a disease: they stood as physical evidence and proof. They represented not

⁴⁹⁴ Pierre Janet, *Psychological Healing: A Historical-Clinical Study II* (New York, 1925), pp. 712-714, as cited in A.R.G. Owen *Hysteria, Hypnosis and Healing: The Work of J.-M Charcot* (London, 1971), p. 93.

⁴⁹⁵ Didi-Huberman (2003), pp. 123-126.

only the character and body of the person portrayed, but acted as souvenirs of a particular moment on the hysterical cycle. Like the casts made from the hands of famous artists and writers, such as those of August Rodin, Adolph Menzel, and the entwined hands of Elizabeth and Robert Browning, the cast hands produced at the Salpêtrière are portrait-like (Fig. 225).⁴⁹⁶ Yet unlike the narratives invoked by the cast hands of lovers and artists, where professional identities and personal intimacies are on display, the cast hands produced at the Salpêtrière are portraits of illness, deformity and disease rather than individuality. In contrast, Rodin's cast hand is shown holding the product of his professional work: a tiny sculpture of a naked female torso that is headless and without limbs. The small body, propped up by his fingers, displays the sculptor's mastery over the female body and its representation. Like Péan, Rodin's profession provided him with a rational and socially acceptable justification for his role in the fragmentation of representations of naked female bodies.

Plaster and wax casts of hysterical bodies and body parts were produced and shown in the medical museum that Charcot established at the Salpêtrière.⁴⁹⁷ Jules Claretie described the museum as:

...une atelier bizarre, sentant l'amphithéâtre et le musée de médecine, où des débris humains traînaient à côté de têtes de criminels, moulées sur nature après échafaud. Rez-de-chaussée singulier où des copies de la Vénus de Milo et des captifs de Michel-Ange faisaient comme des anti-thèses consolantes aux difformités atroces que le mouleur conservait ou modelait pour les vitrines de l'Hôpital...⁴⁹⁸

Photographs of the museum were published in the popular press, showing the variety of objects that were produced and on display at the hospital. Although the objects were exhibited in a medical setting, it was also a site of entertainment and fear, as Claretie's statement attests. As is evident in Claretie's novel, as well as the photographs published along with Fernand Levillain's 1891 article "Charcot et l'école de la Salpêtrière" in *Revue Encyclopédique* and by Maurice Guillemot's 1887 article about the museum in *Paris illustré*, medical *moulages* and casts were shown alongside real skeletons, artistic models and portrait busts (Fig. 226). The museum provided another venue for the creation and exhibition of pathological bodies, as representations of hysterical bodies

⁴⁹⁶ For a discussion of nineteenth-century casts, see Quentin Bajac et al., *À fleur de peau – Le moulage sur nature au XIXe siècle*, exh.cat. Musée d'Orsay (Paris, 2001).

⁴⁹⁷ Charcot asked the Assistance Publique for funding for a museum on 15 September 1878. For further information, see Simon-Dhouailly, pp. 63-66.

⁴⁹⁸ Claretie, p. 112.

were confirmed as diseased and deformed not only by their display in a medical museum but also by their difference to such ideal bodies as the Venus de Milo. The ideal bodies created within the world of art acted as foils against which medical pathologies could be made obvious. Although the majority of casts on display were of fragmented bodies, a full wax model of a naked woman described as suffering from hysteria, was also on show (Fig. 227). Maurice Guillemot described this wax as the object that demanded the most attention in the room:

Une vitrine, qui tient tout le milieu de la pièce, retient l'attention; elle contient, étendu sur le dos, le moulage sur nature du corps entier d'une hystérique morte à la Salpêtrière, hideuse de réalisme, de misère, avec sa maigreur, ses jambes torses, ses épaules déformées, son buste raviné, son ventre sarclé du côté, les os crevant la chair.⁴⁹⁹

For Guillemot, realism was associated with misery. It was an aesthetic of death, deformity and illness. Unlike the idealized bodies of marble and plaster Venuses that lured viewers in by their beauty, this wax woman enticed viewers by her disfigured hips, bony skeleton and sagging skin.

The desire to represent this hysterical body realistically is not only evident through the hyper-realism of the wax figure, a realism that provided so many details that it was considered hideous, but also by its photographic representation (Fig. 228). In the photographic image, the woman is alive, her face is in a crooked grin, her hands are at her side and a bonnet is on her head. In contrast, the wax model shows a sleeping or dead body, eyes closed and head turned to the side. Although the wax body's nakedness, uncovered hair and deformed body suggests that this representation is an unaltered representation and as true to life as possible, the woman's wax hand is placed over her genitals, as if to suggest that this inanimate body also retains the modesty of a young Venus, who simultaneously hides and draws attention to her own sex by the placement of her hand. Despite the realism provided by wax, the body is posed according to artistic conventions, creating a bizarre representation of deformity in an idealized yet deathly pose.

In 1889, the large portrait by Brouillet was reproduced next to a photograph of the Salpêtrière museum in *Revue Encyclopédique* (Fig. 226). This juxtaposition visually linked both Brouillet's canvas and the Salpêtrière museum as sites of realistic representations of hysteria. A comparison between these two images infers a connection

⁴⁹⁹ Maurice Guillemot, "À la Salpêtrière II", *Paris illustré*, 1 October, 1887, p. 371.

between the young hysteric depicted by Brouillet and the emaciated wax woman, as the old wax figure appears to foreshadow the eventual state of women at the Salpêtrière. Fixed into wax, the unconscious woman's body seems like a dead body, drawing connections not only to the dead bodies on display to the Parisian public as a form of spectacle during the late nineteenth century, but to the importance of autopsies in the discovery of invisible diseases such as hysteria.⁵⁰⁰ Although Charcot diagnosed hysteria by the visual symptoms exerted by the living body, he focused on the dead body in order to find, and prove, the biological existence of hysteria. Autopsies were performed in order to dig deep into the brains and bodies of hysterical women to find organic and visible causes of the disease. Mediums that were understood to represent reality objectively, such as wax and photography, provided the means with which the living body could be contained and objectified, making it still and immobile in order for it to be fully studied and documented. But such representations could never replace the human body, which was filled with organs, blood, neurological matter and bones. They could not be cut open to reveal the source of illness. As indexical mediums that provided mimetic representations of the body's exterior, wax and photography prioritized surface. Yet despite their claims to the real, they could never fully replace the real body because they did not have 'insides'.

Like Pasteur's death mask and commemorative photographic portraits, and Péan's wax models, the casting and photographing of bodies had historical links to death. Wax and photography were considered mediums of death because they were used to create objects and images that would remind people of the dead. Like the death masks and casts of beloved pets, lovers and family members, the casts at the Salpêtrière ultimately invoke the absence of living bodies by their presence. Only through the symbolic death of the subject by realistic representation could the hysterical body be real enough to prove the existence of hysteria. Similarly, only through actual death could hysteria be confirmed, as digging into the body to find the organic cause of the disease would have ultimately killed the patient. The 'reality' of hysteria was 'proven' by death and representation as autopsies and realistic depictions, such as those in photography and wax, were required in order to confirm a hysterical diagnosis.

⁵⁰⁰ For a discussion of the public display of dead bodies in Paris, see Schwartz (1998), pp. 45-88.

In the Bedroom: Touching the Hysterical Body

The sexuality of hysterics held a prominent role in the public's fascination with the disease. The sexual temptation invoked by hysterical women was widely publicized in the popular press, as Claretie's *Les amours d'un interne* confirms. Young hysterical women were constructed as sexually available by their frequent representation next to young doctors: in both *Une leçon clinique* and the images in *La Nature*, young medical men, as opposed to old, are touching hysterics' bodies. The intimacy of the relationship between young male doctor and young female patient is evident in the first image in *La Nature*, where the knees of doctor and patient touch and where they are shown hand in hand (Fig. 229). In the second image, the doctor's knee appears to press against the inside of the woman's knee, opening her leg slightly (Fig. 230). By its represented 'touchability', the hysterical body was constructed as sexually available.

Medical texts emerging from the Salpêtrière discussed the sexuality of hysterical women as it was believed that they seduced medical men by their charm and physical attributes. Even though Charcot clearly stated that hysteria did not produce overtly sexual women, the sexuality of hysterics remained of great popular and medical interest. Charcot wrote, along with Pierre Marie, that "As to sexual life, we protest against the opinion universally adopted by the public that all hysterical women have a tendency to lubricity, almost bearing on nymphomania."⁵⁰¹ Salon critics described the hysterical woman's ability to charm and deceive in their discussions of *Une leçon clinique*. As Javel wrote, "Il semble qu'on la voit trembler et frémir, cette malheureuse jeune femme dont les yeux à demi-clos ont, singulière ironie, conservé quelque chose de souriant."⁵⁰² Although Wittman is represented under the focused gaze of Charcot's audience, trapped on the Salpêtrière stage, Javel saw a smile, perhaps mischievous, in her semi-closed eyes. Representations of hysterical women with slight smiles and suggestive glances (as exemplified by the photographs of Augustine as well as the intimate sleeping shots of women in the *Iconographies Photographiques*), presented hysterical female sexuality as pathological yet seductive (Fig. 231, 232). The small grins helped construct the experimental procedures at the hospital as pleasurable and kind, as the women in the photographs stare teasingly out at the viewer, showing no signs of pain.

⁵⁰¹ Charcot and Pierre Marie Janet, *Dictionary of Psychological Medicine* (London, 1892), p. 629.

⁵⁰² Javel, n.p.

Brouillet and Gervex depicted semi-naked unconscious women to lure Salon viewers into their canvases. Both paintings contain a sub-narrative of a young doctor's intimate contact with a bare-chested female patient. In Gervex's portrait, one of Doctor Zacharian's hands lingers near the patient's pink nipple while his other hand, holding a chloroformed cloth, waits to touch her mouth. In Brouillet's work, Doctor Babinsky supports the hysteric's body, his hand beneath her breast, fingers pressed against the boning of her loosened corset while his eyes are focused on her exposed and naked chest. Both works highlight a moment of touch that appears to belie professional conduct yet is rationalized by the medical context and the painting's realist effect. Brouillet justified medical touch and exhibited his medical knowledge by showing Doctor Babinsky's hand under the hysteric's left breast; Charcot claimed that three main hysterogenic points were on the back, leg and under the left breast (Fig. 233). The paintings by Brouillet and Gervex show the intimate connection between sexual desire and medical experimentation as medical male observation and touch are focused on semi-naked, unconscious female bodies. The medical settings, the piercing eyes of the audiences and the suited professional bodies attempt to cloud the overt sexual narrative that lurks within the painted images. Their presence disallows the intimate physical contact between young doctor and patient to progress, though its presence, and promise, remains. The contrast between suited male professionals and undressed female patients constructs boundaries of difference between male and female, clothed and unclothed, sentient and unconscious, healthy and sick. The female bodies become objects of the medical gaze and touch, passive, blind and exposed, while male bodies are empowered with sight, touch and the ability to generate knowledge. For nineteenth-century viewers, the visible attributes of the body produced, validated and maintained a social order based on the binary opposition of male and female bodies. The ability to classify bodies based on visual scrutiny was of utmost importance if the safety of social boundaries were to be preserved.

In contrast to Brouillet's painting and many of the prints from the popular press, such as those in *La Nature*, medical men were not usually photographed with their patients at the Salpêtrière even though their role in the production of visual images and objects was paramount. The first photographs taken in the majority of the hospitals in Paris, including the Salpêtrière, were done by physicians. The mechanical sincerity of the camera was readily appropriated by physicians who hoped to achieve, or be seen to have, the same objectivity. As Charcot wrote, "Behold the truth. I've never said anything else;

I'm not in the habit of advancing things that aren't experimentally demonstrable....I am nothing more than a photographer; I inscribe what I see..."⁵⁰³ Paradoxically, the medical professional's desire to be as objective as photography was encouraged and praised, while the patients' desire to be camera-like was understood as a symptom of hysteria. As is evident in two photographs published in *Nouvelle Iconographie* in 1889, when hysterics' eyes winked like camera shutters or saw only in black and white, they were diagnosed as 'photophobic', their vision understood, and represented, as sick and impaired (Fig. 234).

Despite their invisibility in photographs, medical men helped prepare bodies for photographic recording: clothing was removed to expose obvious signs of disease and bodies were manhandled into pathological poses. As is evident in Poyet's engraving, *Photography at the Salpêtrière*, the photographer and patient were in close proximity (Fig. 235). The photographer could simultaneously adjust the patient and take a photograph since he did not need to be behind or next to the camera in order to take a shot. The intimate contact between patient and photographer is exemplified in a photograph of Londe holding a hysterical body (Fig. 236). In this image, Londe stands behind the patient while the camera's mechanical attachment hangs over the bedpost, thus exposing the intimate connection between the touching of a patient that is required in order to construct a photograph of illness as well as the touch required to activate the camera. The physical relationship between the patient and photographer was considered problematic. The patient's body had to be legible as a pathological body in an identifiable hysterical pose and therefore often required the hands of doctors and photographers to mould it into the desired position. Yet the body's natural pathological contortions were also required to show its disease. Londe described the problems encountered when posing a body, or using supports, when he wrote:

Ces appareils ont le grave inconvénient de donner aux modèles des poses raides et empruntées. En Médecine, il faut éviter ce subterfuge d'une manière absolue, car, autres modifications de la forme, on rencontre souvent des attitudes particulières qui ont été imprimées au malade par l'affection dont il est atteint. Ces attitudes ont une grande valeur au point de vue du diagnostic, et la représentation doit en être faite d'une manière rigoureuse...⁵⁰⁴

There are no photographs of doctors, or photographers, in any of the *Iconographie photographique*. The posing of bodies is never illustrated. The patients are all presented

⁵⁰³ Jean-Martin Charcot, *Leçon du mardi* (Paris, 1887-1888) as translated in Didi-Huberman (2003), p. 29.

⁵⁰⁴ Londe, p. 317.

as isolated and alone, their contorted bodies and dramatic expressions seemingly detached from any manipulation or studio setting.

Although photography at the Salpêtrière was considered a method of clinical and objective documentation, the main prop in the photographic studio was a bed. Pushed against the wall and cornered by the steadfast gaze of a camera, the bed became the site of the production of representations of hysteria. In the majority of photographs coming from the Salpêtrière, particularly those published in the three volumes of the *Iconographie photographique*, the bed's location in the photographic studio is not depicted as it is in Poyet's print. For example, Régnard's photographs of Augustine in a series of *attitudes passionnelles* reveal nothing more than the fact that the woman is in a bed. In one photograph, her face looks up pleasingly with her mouth in a grin, and in another her tongue is sticking out and her body is tangled in sheets (Fig. 237, 238). Another picture in the series shows her sitting on top of the bed's covers while her loose-fitting nightgown slips down her chest and up her bare legs to reveal greater bodily exposure (Fig. 239). Devoid of a medical setting or further visual contextualization, these photographs provide immediate and unrestricted access to a female body in bed. In Planche XXX from the 1878 *Iconographie photographique*, Augustine is shown wrapped in sheets, staring out at the viewer seductively (Fig. 240).⁵⁰⁵ Her 'come hither' pose, exemplified by her intense gaze and raised bare shoulder, recalls earlier artistic precedents such as *Le Coucher* engraved by E. Devéria in 1829 and J.-A. Moulin's photograph *Le Coucher* of 1853, in which women in similar poses, surrounded by sheets and draped cloth, appear to be luring their viewer into bed (Fig. 241, 242). Although the rotation of Augustine's arm and her twisted wrist identify her as hysterical, she is also represented as a seductress. Removed from a medical setting and displayed within a 'bedroom', the photographs of semi-unconscious women taken at the Salpêtrière are very similar to those taken in photographic studios, where reclining naked women were shown in various stages of unconsciousness and undress for the pleasure of their viewers (Fig. 243). Whereas pornographic recording of the female body often centred on the orgasm, Salpêtrière photography focused on the journey to the *arc en cercle*. The representations of naked women in bed united medical, artistic and pornographic photographic practice.

⁵⁰⁵ Other images from this series suggest that Augustine was photographed sitting on a chair. Importantly, all signs of the chair are cropped out of the image, thus making it look like the photographs are of hysterical women in bed.

In contrast to the large number of photographs of women in bed at the Salpêtrière, few exist of men. Photographs of naked male patients became more popular during the 1880s, when Charcot became more interested in studying male hysteria. The increase in the number of photographs of male bodies may be attributed to Londe's interest in producing photographic records of movement as male bodies, with their more pronounced muscularity, produced better accounts of the body in motion than those of women. In 1885, Londe took a series of photographs of a naked male patient in various stages of a hysterical attack (Fig. 244, 245). The male hysteric's body is photographed in a series of contortions while his arms are tied to the bedposts. These photographs are different from ones of women because there are men standing around the male patient's bed while in the photographs of women, the patient is predominantly represented alone or with nurses. In these photographs by Londe, some of the standing men's faces are scratched out while others are on show. The scratching out of faces suggests the desire of medical professionals to distance themselves from the intimate touching that is required in photographic and medical practice. Could it be possible that the medical men wished to be removed while Londe, as the photographer, wanted to be on show? Perhaps Londe wanted to be present in these pictures in order to showcase his technical ability and photographic inventions. These photos are about technological progress and the recording of a body in motion, as were similar photographs by Londe's contemporaries, Etienne-Jules Marey and Eadweard Muybridge, in which various photographs were put together to form a sequence. Londe's desire to create an apparatus that could take multiple photographs in quick succession was not achieved until 1893, when he created a camera that could take twelve photographs at speedy intervals.⁵⁰⁶

Despite the absence of male practitioners in the majority of Salpêtrière photographs, their presence is everywhere, as proven by the photographs' existence. As recorded by Londe, making a photograph required the active participation of medical men: "Suivant les cas, on prendra des épreuves de face, de dos, de trois quarts, de profil; debout ou assis. C'est au médecin qu'il appartiendra d'indiquer les positions dans lesquelles le sujet devra être reproduit."⁵⁰⁷ The photographs, as tools for teaching and learning, implicated the physician and medical student by their very creation. The format and size of photographs catered to medical learning. As Londe wrote, "...il est nécessaire

⁵⁰⁶ For a discussion of Londe's camera, see Albert Londe, "La Photographie dans les sciences médicales", *La Nature*, 1893, 21, 2, pp. 370-374.

⁵⁰⁷ Londe (1892), p. 68.

d'obtenir des épreuves d'un format convenable pour être étudiées par le médecin."⁵⁰⁸

Despite their invisibility, the fingerprints of male professionals linger over the slick surface of the Salpêtrière photographs, thus further confirming physicians' roles in the construction of representations of hysteria.

Two photographs exist of Charcot gripping the wrist of a hysterical woman (Fig. 246). These were discovered in the archives of Saint-Louis in 1985 and were not reproduced in Charcot's publications. In the photographs, Charcot is wearing a dark formal suit, complete with top hat. He is staring out at the viewer, his assertive stance enhanced by his compositional dominance in the photograph. In contrast, the hysteric is shown from the side, wearing a white hospital bonnet, and the top of her dress is pulled down to her waist, exposing a naked upper body. Her bare skin reveals sharp shoulder bones and toned arms, and her face looks down. From the scribbled notes on the side of the photograph, it is known that the woman was suffering from ataxia. Ataxia, a disease that is perhaps most deserving of its place within nineteenth-century definitions of hysteria, was understood for its production of disordered, uncontrollable, paralyzed, and confused bodies. As in *Une leçon clinique*, the illness of the woman in the photograph is indicated by her state of undress and her proximity to clothed medical professionals. The two photographs show the ways in which ataxia, as embodied by the female hysteric, was defined and handled by Charcot and other producers of representations of hysteria. Charcot's grip attests to the disease's reality, as he holds on to its host and prepares it for the photographer. Furthermore, the cuffed hand of a male professional - doctor or photographer - that is shown touching the woman's knee, indicates that close physical contact with sick and naked female bodies was necessary to produce images of hysteria. This photograph exposes a moment in which the hysterical woman and her disease are pinned down and prepared for representation through the touching of male hands and the steady gaze of the camera.

Critics at the 1887 Salon saw Charcot's touch in *Une leçon clinique*. Javel described Charcot as holding the hysteric's arm, claiming that he:

...souligne, d'un gest très naturel de la main droite, le raisonnement qu'il est en train de développer, tandis que, de la main gauche, il tient l'un des bras du sujet, une jeune hystérique soutenue par un interne...⁵⁰⁹

⁵⁰⁸ Londe (1892), p. 332.

⁵⁰⁹ Javel, n.p,

Similarly, Hippolyte Devillers described Charcot as “soutenant d’un bras une femme hypnotisée...”⁵¹⁰ Upon close examination of the painting, it is evident that Charcot’s left hand is not shown: his lower left arm disappears behind the bodice and full skirt of the hysterical woman. Unquestionably, it is the young doctor who holds the patient. Although one could argue that these two critics did not fully look at the painting, this is doubtful as both critics wrote at least a paragraph about the work. It is likely that the critics understood and saw Charcot’s touch in all that concerned the hysterical body, particularly his role in the multiple forms of realistic representation that are shown in Brouillet’s canvas.

**“From the moment she is hypnotized she belongs to us”⁵¹¹:
Hypnosis as Realist Performance**

Charcot’s role in the production of realistic representations of hysteria went beyond drawing, wax and photography. The medical acts and iconographic processes that Charcot performed on his patients constructed hysteria as a disease of performance and representation in which both doctor and patient had starring roles. The novelty of the visuality of hysteria insisted on by Charcot turned hysteria into a theatrical, modern spectacle, thus constantly returning hysteria to what Elizabeth Bronfen calls “a malady of or by representation.”⁵¹² The theatricality of Charcot’s experiments were noted by his contemporaries, such as Doctor Henri Meiges, who recalled in 1898 that, “Il n’en fallut pas d’avantage pour qu’on traitât d’exhibitions théâtrales les séances qu’il consacra à l’étude des manifestations de la grande hystérie.”⁵¹³ Igotus also described Charcot as theatrical, writing that the doctor:

pratiqua en grand le cabotinage scientifique. Le succès a été énorme. O cabotinage de grand allure! Il a profité à M. Charcot, mais à la science aussi. Il a fait avancer la science à la façon de Wagner, le grand cabotin musical!⁵¹⁴

Charcot was not the only man of science associated with performance. Descriptions of the oratory skills of doctors and scientists were well recorded, as performance was a key component medical success. All innovations, discoveries and new technologies had to be brought up before the Académie de Médecine and Académie de Sciences for approval.

⁵¹⁰ Devillers, p. 234.

⁵¹¹ Georges Gilles de la Tourette as cited in Martha Noel Evans, *Fits and Starts: A Genealogy of Hysteria in Modern France* (Ithaca, 1991), p. 37.

⁵¹² Bronfen (1998), p. 175.

⁵¹³ Meiges (1898), p. 43.

⁵¹⁴ Igotus, p. 383.

These debates were recorded and discussed in the popular press, as well as medical and scientific journals, as was the way in which they were delivered. Doctors and scientists were responsible for presenting their work and defending others. Charcot's defence of Pasteur's rabies vaccine was widely known as it was recorded in the press and mentioned in Pasteur's obituaries. The performative culture of medicine and science is also evident by the large events in Paris commemorating men of medicine and science. Pasteur's Jubilee, Bernard's funeral, the opening of new hospitals and the popularity of large conferences dedicated to the sciences were discussed in the press and often included the participation of the French public. Banners, speeches and parades celebrating medicine, science and the republic further show this spectacular side. New medical and scientific discoveries were brought to the public through these large theatrical events, both fulfilling the republican desire to educate the masses and to associate itself with disciplines considered to be of the utmost modernity.

As part of his encouragement and participation in the visual recording of the hysterical body, Charcot applied a modern method of performance, hypnosis, to his armoury of realistic forms of representation. Like hysteria, hypnosis always implicated mimesis in the rendering of reality: the hysterical patient acted out the symptoms of hysteria as they were suggested and shown to her by medical men. Hypnosis was Charcot's realist technique and the hysterical body his medium. Significantly, hypnosis allowed Charcot to 'freeze' the body into specific gestures that corresponded to his conception of the *grand attaque* and its set poses. Charcot and his colleague used an assortment of lights, metals, large tuning forks, clocks and drums to set hysterical women into semi-unconscious states. The multiple modes of making women unconscious are visually evident in the volumes of the *Iconographie photographique* and in the images that accompanied Régnault and Bourneville's article in *La Nature* (Fig. 247, 248, 249). Like anaesthetics, these tools and procedures allowed medical men to have control of consciousness. Not surprisingly, anaesthetics were also used in medical experimentation and control at the Salpêtrière.

In his lecture on metallotherapy and hypnosis, Charcot described the results of his experiments on the influence of gesture on the expression of physiognomy and vice versa. Charcot believed that when a body was made to assume a specific gesture, the face corresponded with an appropriate expression. Charcot wrote that the patient is:

transformed into a kind of expressive statue, an immobile model representing the most varied expressions with striking truth, and which artists can most certainly,

turn to the best account. The immobility of attitudes obtained in this way is highly favourable to photographic reproduction. With the assistance of Monsieur Londe, responsible for the photographic service of the Salpêtrière, we have obtained a series of photographs, the most interesting of which we have reproduced here, and which, we note, were taken during the earliest experiments attempted in this domain.⁵¹⁵

Hypnosis, like photography, could make a body still for medical study. Hypnosis was a method of control. The total mastery that medical men were understood to have over hypnotized bodies is evident in Cartaz's 1878 article in *La Nature*:

Disons d'abord que cet état léthargique, somnambulique, si l'on veut, cesse aussi subitement qu'il est apparu et cela avec la plus grande facilité; il suffit, par exemple, de souffler sur le visage du sujet. La léthargie s'efface, il y a une apparence de confusion légère et la malade sort de son rêve sans le moindre souvenir de ce qui s'est passé.⁵¹⁶

Through the use of hypnosis, Charcot was able to create a body that appeared to be detached from consciousness, a blank slate he could put to sleep and wake up with a simple breath. Hypnosis allowed him to display the workings of the unconscious, the relationship between mind and body, on this malleable "expressive statue". Young artists were also interested in taking advantage of the expressive potential of hypnotized bodies. Gérôme's students famously hypnotized one of their female models after frequenting a lecture by Charcot; she almost died and Gérôme's atelier was closed for a month (it is unknown if Brouillet was a part of this class).⁵¹⁷ For Charcot, hypnosis was the process through which hysteria was revealed, as hypnosis brought hysterical symptoms to the surface. It 'proved' that the disease had an organic cause. Photographing these hypnotized moments allowed Charcot to further fix these symptoms on the body's exterior as recording these moments seemed to prove their reality. Whereas the living patient would wake from hypnosis, the photographic representation kept the hysteric locked in a cataleptic trance. Significantly, the still poses held by hypnotized women made their photographic representation easier. Their hysterical fits were slowed down for the camera so as not to cause blurring. It was easier to study and photograph the hysterical body one move at a time.

⁵¹⁵ Charcot, "Leçons sur la métallothérapie et l'hypnotisme", *Oeuvres complètes*, IX, p. 443, as translated in Didi-Huberman, appendix 17, p. 294.

⁵¹⁶ Cartaz (1878), p. 105.

⁵¹⁷ Showalter (1997), p. 35.

Charcot's studies on hypnosis began in the late 1870s. In 1882, he presented his famous paper, "On the various nervous states determined by hypnotization in hysterics" to the Academie des Sciences as part of his bid for membership. Charcot argued that hypnosis was a pathological condition and a manifestation of hysteria. He believed that hypnosis could be used as a tool to diagnose hysteria, as he argued that only hysterics, or those with hysteric predispositions, could be hypnotized. Charcot's works created and contributed to the public obsession with hypnosis during the 1880s. Max Dessoir's *Bibliographie des Modernen Hypnotismus* published in Berlin in 1888 calculated that between 1840 and 1880, less than 30 publications on hypnosis were made per decade in relevant European publications while 1030 publications appeared during the 1880s.⁵¹⁸ During the 1889 Exposition Universelle, both the International Congress on Physiological Psychology and the first International Congress on Experimental and Therapeutic Hypnotism met to discuss hypnosis. Furthermore, the first issue of *Revue de l'hypnotisme experimentale et thérapeutique* appeared in 1887, claiming that, "L'hypnotisme est à l'ordre du jour. Son étude est devenue scientifique."⁵¹⁹ Despite the desire of Charcot and other doctors to keep hypnosis in the medical realm, it remained a form of public entertainment and was under great scrutiny. As Doctors Bourneville and Regnard wrote, "Le charlatanisme et la supercherie ont été tellement mêlés à tous les fait qui regardent l'hypnotisme qu'il est maintenant ordinaire de dire que quiconque s'en est occupé a trompé ou a été trompé."⁵²⁰ People could take part in hypnosis to momentarily free themselves from social constraints, and could also take pleasure in viewing the spectacle of hypnotized bodies. Images of hypnosis as public spectacle were very similar to those showing it the Salpêtrière. As is evident by the non-medical images of hypnosis in *La Nature* which show a hypnotist performing on a clothed male subject, the acts performed by hypnotic victims were similar to those demanded from hysterical subjects (Fig. 250, 251). As is shown in both the images in *La Nature* and those in the *Iconographie photographique*, hypnotized bodies were made to fall down, lie across chairs and were pricked with needles. Emmanuel Arène described in his 1887 article in *République Française*, which appeared on the same page as the paper's criticism of Brouillet's painting at the Salon, how his friends took part in hypnosis as a form of entertainment. He wrote that the experience left them "troublés, agités; quelques-uns avaient l'air de

⁵¹⁸ Max Dessoir, *Bibliographie des Modernen Hypnotismus* (Berlin, 1888) as cited in Derek Forrest, *Hypnotisme: A History* (London, 2000), p. 228.

⁵¹⁹ Edgar Berillon, *Revue de l'hypnotisme expérimentale et thérapeutique* (Paris, 1887), introduction.

⁵²⁰ Bourneville and Régard, "Les Phénomènes d'hypnotisme", *La Nature*, 9, 1, p. 542.

souffrir beaucoup.”⁵²¹ Despite the pleasure of the spectacle, hypnosis also provoked fear and anxiety as it was believed that hypnosis could be applied without consent, thus transforming the innocent public into social deviants, thieves and murderers. The largely publicized 1888 trial of Henri Chambige contributed to this fear, as he declared his innocence by claiming that he had been under hypnosis when he killed a married woman. Concurrently, hypnosis was being explored as a means to fortify the country. In 1891, Alfred Fouillé wrote that the whole of France could improve if everyone concentrated on the country’s strength.⁵²² Charcot’s studies on hypnosis went beyond public entertainment and medical experimentation when they were appropriated by his followers and transformed into law. Gilles de la Tourette’s *L’hypnotisme et les états analogues au point de vue médico-legal* published in 1887 and J. Liégeois *De la Suggestion et du Somnambulisme dans les rapports avec la Jurisprudence et la Médecine-Légale* of 1889 are examples of Charcot’s direct influence over state affairs and Republican policies.⁵²³

The support of Charcot’s theories by his followers into the last years of the 1880s was crucial for Charcot’s reputation. In a widely publicized debate following the publication of Doctor Bernheim’s book *De la Suggestion dans l’état hypnotique* in 1884, Bernheim and the medical school of Nancy argued that Charcot’s understanding of hypnosis was wrong.⁵²⁴ Bernheim claimed that “L’hypnotisme de la Salpêtrière est un hypnotisme de culture.”⁵²⁵ Bernheim had found that most humans were hypnotizable and claimed that hypnosis was based on suggestion. If Bernheim was to be believed, Charcot’s theories on hypnotism, and in turn the laws based upon them, would be false, and hypnosis could no longer be relied upon to confirm a hysterical diagnosis. Furthermore, it would suggest that hypnosis was used at the Salpêtrière for more sinister purposes, as public debates focused on the ways in which hypnotizers, medical or otherwise, could take advantage of women who were under their trance. For example, Liégeois’ book makes reference to a story in the press in which a dentist was sent to jail for ten years because it was believed that he had sex with a young patient while she was under hypnosis for a tooth operation. Gilles de Tourette’s published account of hypnosis

⁵²¹ Emmanuel Arène, “Chronique: de l’hypnotisme”, *La République Française*, 30 April 1887, p. 2.

⁵²² See Silverman for a discussion of how hypnosis infiltrated various parts of nineteenth-century life, pp. 78-91.

⁵²³ Gilles de la Tourette, *L’hypnotisme et les états analogues au point de vue médico-legal* (Paris, 1887) and J. Liégeois *De la Suggestion et du Somnambulisme dans les rapports avec la Jurisprudence et la Médecine-Légale* (Paris, 1889).

⁵²⁴ For an account of the rivalry between the Salpêtrière and school at Nancy, see Owen, pp. 182-206 and Forrest, pp. 228-253.

⁵²⁵ As cited in Alain Lellouch, *Jean Martin Charcot et les origines de la gériatrie* (Paris, 1992), p. 267.

in 1887 discusses how young doctors at the Salpêtrière tried to get Wittman to undress and take a bath in front of them while she was still under a hypnotic trance after one of their classes. Despite being under their spell and having just performed for an audience, Wittman refused.⁵²⁶

Charcot fought back against the opposition to hypnosis by claiming that he was only interested in *grand hypnotisme*, and therefore did not argue that *petite hypnotisme* could be found in others, particularly those with hysterical susceptibilities. He also sought to redeem his reputation by publishing a paper for *La Revue de l'hypnotisme* in 1887, in which he discussed the dangers of hypnosis when used by the unqualified public. He explained how the Salpêtrière had used hypnotism to cure a young boy who had been hypnotized by a state magnetizer as well as a young woman who had been hypnotized at a town fair. This paper revealed the social benefits of hypnosis when used within the medical realm, thus justifying and purifying a process that was often associated with taking sexual advantage. It also allowed Charcot to justify his fixation on making people unconscious. Situated safely within the medical realm, the seductive and dangerous art of hypnosis was transformed into a necessary modern procedure as it was made scientific. Charcot's ability to bring hypnosis into the scientific realm, as well as the popularity of his work on hypnosis, is evident in an article in *Journal de médecine et de chirurgie pratique* and published on the occasion of the doctor's death:

...le Maître abordant hardiment les sciences dites occultes et portant la lumière dans cette région incertaine qui paraissait devoir être le domaine exclusif des rêveurs, du diable ou simplement des charlatans...C'est cette partie de l'oeuvre du savant qui a frappé surtout le monde, le populaire, car Charcot avait non seulement la renommée scientifique mais il avait une véritable popularité.⁵²⁷

Revue de l'hypnotisme expérimental et thérapeutique also thanked Charcot for making hypnosis legitimate in the scientific sphere when they wrote that, "Grâce l'autorité de sa parole, l'hypnotisme et les études qui en dérivent acquéraient immédiatement droit de cite dans la science officielle."⁵²⁸ Charcot further legitimated hypnosis as a valuable medical technique when he allowed Doctor Dumontpallier to borrow Wittman in 1888.

Dumontpallier used Wittman in his own studies, as well as during his speech at the *Congrès international de l'hypnotisme* in 1889. Wittman's portrayal as a star hysteric

⁵²⁶ de la Tourette, p. 203.

⁵²⁷ "La mort de Charcot", *Journal de médecine et de chirurgie pratique*, September 1893, p. 642 (Salpêtrière Archives, Charcot obituaries).

⁵²⁸ "La mort de M. le Professeur Charcot", *Revue de l'hypnotisme expérimental et thérapeutique*, 1894, 8, p. 34 (Salpêtrière Archives, Charcot obituaries).

was confirmed at the *Exposition Universelle* where she not only performed for Dumontpallier, but was also represented on the walls of the art exhibition in Brouillet's painting and in the medical photographs at the photographic exhibition.

The paintings of hypnosis did not go unnoticed at the 1887 Salon. Merson declared that hypnosis was a subject that "à cette heure, est des plus actuels et des plus attrayants."⁵²⁹ That Brouillet chose to represent hypnosis by depicting a hysteric is not surprising, as young hysterical women were believed to be the most susceptible to hypnosis. As Bourneville and Regnard claimed, hypnosis "ira plus vite et plus sûrement en prenant une hystérique. De celles-là, les jeunes seront préférables, elles sont plus sensibles, plus impressionnables."⁵³⁰ As is evident in the prints accompanying the text in *La Nature*, a young hysterical woman was the ideal object of hypnosis. Brouillet pictorially exhibited the hypnotic state of Wittman by painting her in Doctor Babinsky's arms. Babinsky, Charcot's *chef de clinique*, was well known for his experiments with hypnosis. *L'illustration* published an article in January 1887 that described how he was able to transfer hysterical symptoms from one patient to another while they were under his hypnotic trance.⁵³¹ Brouillet's depiction of M. Duval, biologist and head of the École des Beaux-Arts, also contributed to the construction of hypnosis as a valuable medical procedure because Duval was an expert on hypnosis, having written an article about it in *Nouveau Dictionnaire de Médecine et Chirurgie pratique* published in 1874.⁵³²

Roger Ballu, who ultimately praised Brouillet's painting, nonetheless prefaced his discussion of *Une leçon clinique* with "...retrouvons à l'hôpital; ce ne sera pas pour longtemps, je vous assure...Que de médecine, bon Dieu! L'hypnotisme, oh, le cauchemar!"⁵³³ Other newspapers, such as *Gazette de France* objected to the painting's subject matter as they believed hypnosis was cruel. Alexis Martin wrote in *Guide du Visiteur – La Peinture et la Sculpture au Salon de 1887*, published as a supplement to *La Gazette des Femmes*, that:

...nous approuvons peu, pour notre part, la tendance des artistes à reproduire ces pénibles scènes chirurgicales; voir souffrir, opérer, hypnotiser une femme au milieu d'une quinzaine de messieurs en vêtements noirs est un spectacle qui, malgré tout le talent déployé, sera toujours d'un médiocre intérêt.⁵³⁴

⁵²⁹ Merson, p. 282.

⁵³⁰ Bourneville and Régnard, "Les Phénomènes d'hypnotisme", *La Nature*, 9, 1, 1881, p. 408.

⁵³¹ "L'influence de l'aimant dans l'hypnotisme", *L'illustration*, 22 January 1887, pp. 66-67.

⁵³² Weisberg, p. 425.

⁵³³ Ballu, n.p.

⁵³⁴ Martin, p. 34.

Unlike the majority of critics who praised paintings with medical themes as historical documents for future generations, Martin expressed “profound antipathie” for these works with unpleasant (“ingrates”) subjects. After considering Gervex’s *Avant l’opération*, Martin advised that “nous fuyons vite vers des plus modeste”.⁵³⁵ Despite Martin’s stated lack of interest and dislike for medical narratives, it is interesting to point out that these works were nonetheless described in detail. The fact that this publication was targeted at women makes it apparent that such themes were deemed more socially suitable for a male audience, and that these works were not understood as welcoming to female viewers. Had Brouillet and Gervex not illustrated this in their paintings, in which suited male bodies fix their eyes on half-naked, immobile and unconscious women? Female audiences may also have had trouble with the depiction of Charcot and of hypnosis itself, understood as an act that not only made women vulnerable to male sexual appetites but that also diagnosed hysteria. Ignotus acknowledged a gender divide in reactions to Charcot’s work when he wrote that Charcot “étonna l’homme. Il effraya la femme.”⁵³⁶ Women, whether hysterical or not, were considered to be more susceptible to hypnosis than men. Bourneville and Regnard wrote that, “il est peu de femmes que l’on ne puisse hypnotiser.”⁵³⁷ Arène’s article on hypnosis also described in detail the ways in which the *hypnotiseur* took advantage of women by having them kiss him and sit on his lap,⁵³⁸ and *Le Courrier Français* published the article, “Ce que l’Hypnotisme peut faire” with drawings of women undressing while under a hypnotic trance.⁵³⁹ Therefore, it is likely that bourgeois women chose not to subject themselves to a process that could possibly undo the proper comportment of bourgeois femininity that they had worked so hard to fabricate.

There was another canvas at the Salon, and in the same room as *Une leçon clinique*, that depicted hypnosis but this painting received little mention in contemporary reviews. The Swedish artist Richard Bergh’s *La Séance d’hypnose* (referred to as *Suggestion* by M. le Roux in *Le Temps* and *Somnambule* by Fourcaud) depicts three men and a woman watching as a *magnétiseur* hypnotizes a seated woman (Fig. 252). This work was described by Fourcaud as a “tableaux de médecine” along with the paintings by Brouillet and Gervex. Yet unlike the other two images, the scene in Bergh’s painting is

⁵³⁵ Martin, pp. 41-42.

⁵³⁶ Ignotus, p. 383.

⁵³⁷ Bourneville and Régnard (1881), p. 408.

⁵³⁸ Arène, p. 2.

⁵³⁹ “Ce que l’Hypnotisme peut faire”, *Le Courrier Français*, 29 May, 1887, pp. 6-7.

not a hospital room but a domestic space. In contrast to the bare walls and institutional settings depicted by Gervex and Brouillet, Bergh has painted a room with flowered wallpaper, covered chairs and a couch. Ponsonailhe described the painting in his Salon review in *L'Artiste* as showing "...une expérience entre intimes..."⁵⁴⁰ The four figures depicted by Bergh watching the hypnosis seem to be onlookers and part of a domestic séance rather than medical students. Although all the figures on the right of the canvas are dressed similarly in black and stare at the hypnosis taking place, there are no instruments or medical paraphernalia depicted. The identities of the figures in Bergh's painting are not referred to in the painting's title nor in contemporary reviews, thus diminishing the potential of Bergh's painting to be seen as a historical document or significant portrait. Although the painting's absence of celebrity sitters may be seen as contributing to the painting's lack of notice by Salon critics, its subject was certainly fashionable. It seems likely, particularly when comparing the depiction of women in the three medical paintings, that the lack of attention given to Bergh's work was caused by the way in which he depicted a hypnotized woman. The woman in *La séance d'hypnose* is fully clothed, her body is slumped and as shapeless as the couch on which she sits. Unlike the unconscious working-class women painted by Brouillet and Gervex, this woman is not undressed nor is she poor or beautiful. In contrast to the other representations of women, whose passive and pathological states contributed to their sexual appeal, the hypnotized condition of the woman painted by Bergh makes her less attractive – her brow is furrowed, her body is lumpy and her blank eyes threatened to roll back into her head. Whereas Wittman's curved back, unfastened dress and position next to a stretcher symbolized the promise of her horizontal hysterical climax, the woman in *La séance d'hypnose* is devoid of sexual appeal as she is seated, supported by pillows and conservatively dressed. Although the woman in Bergh's painting is no doubt hypnotized, she is not necessarily a hysteric: she is not depicted in a medical setting, nor does she bear any overt signs of hysteria. Did her lack of overt illness contribute to the critic's lack of admiration for this picture? Or did her class position forbid an obviously sexed rendering or reading?

Women in unconscious states fascinated men at the Salpêtrière. The majority of photographs in the first volume of *Iconographie Photographique* are of unconscious hysterical women, sleeping, yawning and in the various stages of hysterical attacks

⁵⁴⁰ Ponsonailhe (1887), pp. 48-49.

(particularly the moments in which the female body goes unconscious) (Fig. 253, 254). Hypnosis allowed medical men to control the stages of hysteria because under hypnosis they could put the body to sleep, make it perform an *attitude passionnelle* or *état normal*, wake it up, put it back to sleep again...sometimes for days. The hypnotized body mimicked hysterical symptoms as they were suggested by the medical man, thus allowing the doctor to be in control of their construction and their demolition. Yet hypnosis, like hysteria, could never be fruitful without the intervention of the doctor. Hypnosis, like hysteria, needed someone to visualize its pathological body, to make it perform.

Most discussions of hysteria since the 1970s have been interested in the ways in which Charcot and hysterical women worked together to perform – women could act out the symptoms while he directed.⁵⁴¹ Although this approach can be seen to empower the hysterical woman, as she is given agency, choice and the ability to represent herself, it also disregards the brutal objectification of the hysterical body as it was photographed, cast and experimented upon.⁵⁴² The hysterical woman's performance has also been understood as a rebellion against patriarchal culture, and as a result of her entanglement in a world in which she has no control. As Janet Beizer argues, the inarticulate language expressed by the hysterical body is in fact the language of hysteria created by Charcot mapped onto the female body. Hysterical women, for Beizer, are “ventriloquized bodies” and Charcot the puppet master. Sander Gilman claims that hysterical women learned to perform hysterical behaviour by mimicking the images produced at the Salpêtrière.⁵⁴³ The performances at the Salpêtrière, therefore, must be understood as an intricate and multifaceted network of both mutual participation and individual rebellion. By reading Brouillet's painting from left to right, it is evident that the iconography of hysteria produced at the Salpêtrière, symbolized in *Une leçon clinique* by Richer's drawing, provided visual representations of hysterical bodies that patients could emulate and doctors could use as diagnostic templates. Yet reading the painting from right to left illustrates how the female body is simultaneously pathologized and transformed into art as it is filtered through the male audience, whose professions demanded the study and

⁵⁴¹This is one of Didi-Huberman's main points. For an account of the varying views on the role of patient and doctor in performances at the Salpêtrière, see Elisabeth Bronfen, *The Knotted Subject*, particularly Chapter 4, “Jean-Martin Charcot's Vampires”, pp. 174-239.

⁵⁴² Carol Armstrong argues that “The photogenic hysteria of Augustine: that was a real rape forced upon her weekly for a good long period of time.” Armstrong (2003), n.p.

⁵⁴³ Sander L. Gilman, “The Image of the Hysteric” in *Hysteria Beyond Freud*. Although I agree with Gilman's argument, I do not see, as Gilman does, that the representation of Wittman in Brouillet's painting is looking at the Richter drawing in order to learn how to perform. Wittman's eyes are closed, or partially so, and her head is turned away from Richer's drawing.

creation of realistic representations of hysteria. Although the hysterical patient could participate in the performance, it was only through male bodies and realist modes of representation that the hysteric and hysteria were made 'real'.

Hypnosis promised to uncover the 'real' hysterical female body and prepare it for observation while it also constructed a theatrical setting in which the female body could remain hidden behind her hypnotic trance. While Wittman's depicted state of partial undress parallels the clinical striptease she was made to perform, she was also clothed by the symptoms and stigmata constructed within medical iconography. Although hypnosis had the realist medium *par excellence* – an actual living body – hypnosis, like the hysteric, could never be fully trusted to reveal the truth. The patients' subjectivities, agencies and identities always threatened to emerge, thus exposing the frailty of hysteria and hypnosis as stable medical conditions and procedures. Although the physical presence of a patient's body was seen to attest to hysteria's reality, and in turn, the physical manifestations of hysteria, as produced by the medical professional's practice of hypnosis, attempted to fix the malady on the body's surface, this 'unseeable' disease could never be pinned down regardless of the multiple realist modes and mediums of representation that sought it out. The historic and cultural connotations of hypnosis and hysteria constantly threatened to erode the seemingly rational façade of modern scientific medicine and realist formal strategies. The sexual lure of observing and manipulating the body always threatened to fall into the world fantasy and pleasure. The hysterical female body was ultimately a realist trope. Despite the desire to secure and 'prove' hysteria's presence through realist representations, the multiplicity of these modes of recording ultimately pointed to hysteria's transience and absence of the real.

Electrotherapy as Realist Brush

An electrotherapy machine was represented in the centre of Brouillet's canvas in order to help prove the existence of hysteria and contain the sense of desire invoked by hypnosis and the depiction of a semi-nude woman in close proximity to clothed men. Placed on the table to Charcot's right, the electrotherapy machine and its various attachments are the only obvious medical instruments depicted in the canvas. Like hypnosis, electrotherapy was believed to prove that hysteria existed by producing visible evidence on the body's surface. Electrotherapy was most famously used by Duchenne de Boulogne during the mid nineteenth century, who used it as a means to find a link between

physiological expressions and gestures and their accompanying feelings and emotions.⁵⁴⁴ The popularity of his work is exemplified by the numerous publications of his book, *De l'électrisation localisée et de son application à la pathologie et à la thérapeutique*, which was first published in 1855, and then reedited and reprinted in 1862 and 1872. The photographic records that Duchenne produced to accompany his discoveries provided visible evidence of his procedures and discoveries. As the photographs show, Duchenne touched the patient's face with an electrical probe or brush (Fig. 255). The electrical current would cause the facial muscles to contract, thus causing the patient to assume an expression. Charcot's manipulation of hypnotized hysterical bodies into particular gestures can be seen as evolving from Duchenne's procedures (Fig. 256. 257). Significantly, the religious poses held by Duchenne's patients can also be seen as iconographic predecessors to the representations emerging from the Salpêtrière under Charcot's leadership. Duchenne believed his experiments would benefit medicine and art, as his process and photographs could provide artists with a means of realistically representing human emotions. He wrote:

Les maîtres de l'Art n'ont pas toujours su trouver les lignes fondamentales. [...] après les avoir instinctivement dessinées avec une grande vérité dans une esquisse, ils les ont perdues en finissant leur travail sans pouvoir les retrouver. L'électrisation localisée [...] fait connaître la cause physique de tous ces plis, de toutes ces rides en provoquant la contraction des muscles partiellement ou par groupes [...], permet de formuler à coup sûr les règles qui doivent guider l'artiste...⁵⁴⁵

Duchenne's belief in the fusion of art and medicine is also evident when he used a metaphor of painting when referring to his use of the rheophore brush. This is apparent when he claimed in 1862 that, "Armé de rhéophores, on pourrait, comme la nature elle-même, peindre sur le visage de l'homme les lignes expressives des émotions de l'âme."⁵⁴⁶ Duchenne's belief in a unity between art and medicine, and the commonalities between the possibilities of paint and electricity, is evidenced by the donation of his personal collection of medical photographs to the École des Beaux-Arts in 1875. The use of these photographs by artists also suggests how photography became heir to the tête d'expression.

⁵⁴⁴ For a discussion of Duchenne de Boulogne's studies and corresponding photographs, see Jean-François Debord, "Le mécanisme de la physionomie humaine: la vie et l'oeuvre de Duchenne de Boulogne" in Jean Claire (ed), *L'âme au corps – arts et sciences, 1793-1993*, Grand Palais, (Paris, 1993), pp. 412-419.

⁵⁴⁵ Duchene de Boulogne, *L'Expression des émotions chez l'homme et chez les animaux* (Paris, 1872) as cited in Debord, pp. 416-419.

⁵⁴⁶ Duchenne de Boulogne (1872) as cited quoted in Debord, p. 416.

Electricity was used at the Salpêtrière for therapeutic and experimental purposes. An electrotherapy room was created at the hospital in 1877.⁵⁴⁷ The 1879 volume of the *Iconographie Photographique* and Charcot's *Oeuvres complètes* are filled with photographs that are similar to those created by Duchenne. Significantly, Blanche was often the woman photographed going through electrotherapy. In the 1879 volume, an unknown male hand is holding a metal stick to Blanche's throat (Fig. 258). Although her neck muscle is exposed and rigid, she appears to be in little pain. Such photographs contradict electrotherapy as it was discussed in the adjoining text:

W...a été électrisée: le délire n'en a pas moins continué. Alimentation par la sonde oesophagienne. Elle a vomi une partie des liquides ingérés. Insomnie; bavardage incessant. On l'a placée sur la chaise-percée, elle a uriné.⁵⁴⁸

The violence of electrical experimentation is erased from the photographs as is the individual who is in charge of its application. Although the text refers to Doctor Vigouroux, head of the electrical unit at the Salpêtrière, he is not fully present in the photographs. Similarly, Brouillet did not depict him in close contact with the machine with which he was associated. Rather, Brouillet painted Doctor Vigouroux in the front row of the crowd, recognized by his aged face, black cap and bushy white moustache. The distance between practitioner, patient and the tools of experimentation infers that Vigouroux had already performed, or shortly would. Although Brouillet showed Charcot as Wittman's co-star, the representation of an empty chair and full glass of water suggests that Charcot will eventually sit down and let others have a turn.

The use of electrotherapy at the Salpêtrière was widely known. In 1885, *La Nature* published an illustrated article about the electrotherapy room at the Salpêtrière (Fig. 259). As is evident in a picture accompanying the text, numerous patients were brought in and attached to a large machine that produced electrical currents. Patients received different types of electrotherapy depending on their illness, as is illustrated in *La Nature* in which a group of patients consisting of men and women line up for treatment while in another corner a woman is dealt with privately. The electrotherapy procedure shown on the right was performed on an average of around 180 people per day, while that on the left tended 200 people.⁵⁴⁹ A few months after the 1887 Salon, *Le monde illustré* published a series of gouaches by Daniel Vierge of various rooms at the hospital,

⁵⁴⁷ Doctor Z, "L'électricité à la Salpêtrière", *La Nature*, 17 October 1885, p. 305-306.

⁵⁴⁸ Bourneville and Régnard (1879), p. 15.

⁵⁴⁹ Doctor Z., p. 305.

including the electrotherapy room. There is an image depicting Doctor Vigouroux touching the arm of a bare-chested hysterical woman with his electrical brush as well as an image of the many women, men and children receiving electrotherapy in the Salpêtrière's *bains électrique* (Fig. 260, 261).⁵⁵⁰ Electrotherapy rooms, like photography studios, lecture theatres, laboratories and operating rooms, were modern scientific spaces. The electrotherapy machine was a new apparatus that symbolized technology and science, thus making it the ideal tool of modern medicine.

As with hypnosis, Charcot was more interested in electrotherapy as an investigatory tool rather than therapeutic method.⁵⁵¹ Charcot, like Duchenne, saw the rheophore as an electric paint brush that could visibly illustrate the relationship between mind and body.⁵⁵² Yet unlike hypnosis, which was riddled with controversy, electrotherapy was considered modern, objective and beyond personal exploitation. Electrotherapy allowed for the manipulation of the hysterical body in the same way that hypnosis did but under a technical guise as it contained the elements of science and modernity that hypnotism lacked. The visible presence of the rheophore in *Une leçon clinique* helped make hypnosis appear more technical and rational, thus masking the obsessive observations and clinical experimentations Charcot and his colleagues performed on scantily clad women. The depiction of a modern medical apparatus contributed to *Une leçon clinique*'s status as contemporary while also attesting to its realism. The electric brush of the electrotherapy machine, which is perched over the corner of the wooden table, symbolically refers to Brouillet's paintbrush. This imbues the act of painting with the mechanical modernity and objectivity of electricity, thus symbolically aligning the painting with the assumed technological sincerity and abilities of photography. Gervex used a similar artistic convention by aligning his paintbrush with Péan's modern surgical tools. Electricity was modern and non-human and therefore appeared void of subjectivity. Yet behind the technical façade of realistic procedures, touch remains. Vigouroux's brush touched the patient thus transforming her into the medium of his electrical performance while Brouillet's brush touched the canvas in order to create an image of her body. Touch in representation threatens to rupture the

⁵⁵⁰ Le article was published in *Monde illustré*, 7 August 1887.

⁵⁵¹ Forrest suggests that Charcot didn't turn to hypnosis as a therapeutic method because he was skeptical about psychological methods that he believed lacked precision and clarity. Forrest, p. 227.

⁵⁵² Charcot referred to the machine as a "coup de pinceaux", which Didi-Huberman has translated to "electric paintbrush". For a further discussion of this tool, see Didi-Huberman (2003), pp. 199-203.

objectivity attributed to realism as it alludes to desire and physical contact. Yet touch is also needed to confirm the presence of the real.

Conclusion: “Triste archives de l’humanité souffrante”

Painting, photography, casting, hypnosis and electrotherapy all require touch. Although the opticality and meticulous detailing of realistic representations construct a sense of distance and neutrality between doctor and patient, and artist and model, the close scrutiny involved in the production of realistic creations confirms bodily presence. The required intimacy of touching and observing bodies belies the assumed detachment and objectivity of realist practice and modern scientific medicine. The multiple forms of realism, compounded by the excessive number of representations of hysteria produced at the Salpêtrière, reveal a madness that simultaneously goes beyond the requirements of medical practice and also defines the creating and collecting practices of the Salpêtrière. The insanity of the hospital’s collection was noted by Maurice Guillemot, who claimed that:

Bien que fort intéressant, le cabinet du docteur Charcot laisse une impression pénible, comme le souvenir d’un musée des horreurs, d’une réunion de gnomes, de monstres, d’êtres fantastiques, chimériques, de visions de cauchemars empruntées aux cycles infernaux du Dante ou à l’oeuvre macabre de Poe. Triste archives de l’humanité souffrante, horrible ossuaire de l’hospice et de la clinique...⁵⁵³

For Guillemot, the realistic representations commissioned by Charcot were distressing and painful, sad archives for the future. In contrast, Salon critics celebrated Brouillet’s painting as a realistic document that offered the spectacle of hysteria in the form of an unconscious young woman with bare skin. Brouillet’s realism was more palatable and appealing than the realistic images and objects produced at the Salpêtrière – perhaps this is why Brouillet’s painting, rather than a scene from ‘real life’, was used as the model for Spitzner’s wax version of Charcot’s lecture. Created for an entertainment venue, hysteria needed to be shown as spectacular in order to draw a crowd (Fig. 262).⁵⁵⁴ Perhaps this is also the reason why Brouillet’s painting was never bought by Charcot or the Salpêtrière.

⁵⁵³ Maurice Guillemot, “A la Salpêtrière II”, *Paris illustré*, 1 October 1887, p. 371.

⁵⁵⁴ In 1908, Spitzner produced a full wax model of Brouillet’s *Une leçon clinique* that was open to the Parisian public.

Une leçon clinique shows the ways in which realistic representations of the hysterical female body involved a process of inclusion and exclusion in an attempt to construct the most real representations of hysteria. The hysterical woman, as the embodiment of this disease, was the site on which realisms fought to prove the reality of hysteria. Although the correspondence between different discourses of verisimilitude aided in the construction of a shared definition and iconography of hysteria, the layering and appropriation of realistic representations, from fifteenth-century miniatures to photographic *académies*, ultimately exposed the lack of evidence to prove that the disease existed. How could realism represent a body that was simultaneously sentient and unconscious, controlled and chaotic, seductive and repulsive, real and unreal? Nineteenth-century hysteria and realistic modes of representation were both mimetic performances and processes that mimicked the “reality” defined and demanded by male professionals. Fluctuating between order and disorder, presence and absence, similarity and difference, realism as a mimetic agent could never pin down and secure ‘the wandering womb’. Rather, realism veiled the hysterical body, providing yet another layer to an empty shell.

Conclusion

The 1886 and 1887 Salon portraits of Pasteur, Péan and Charcot were again on show during the 1889 *Exposition Universelle* in Paris. They were displayed in different buildings and in various rooms – according to the artist's status and nationality - but all were used to once again exhibit the skills of the artists and the import of their famous sitters. William Walton's large illustrated catalogue of the exhibition, that reproduced prints of the paintings by Bonnat, Brouillet and Gervex, discussed many of the works with scientific themes. With regard to the portraits by Gsell, Gervex and Brouillet, he wrote:

The contemporary human interest, the attitudes of many trained intelligences in presence of the confrontation of old problems by new methods, the mere recording of new triumphs of science – these seem to have been the propelling influences...it is the intelligent presentation of these unpictorial things that gives the modern works a greater general interest than mere good paintings alone would do, - suffering humanity (potential and actual) stops to regard these scenes with a quickness of apprehension that would not be evoked by any excellence of *facture*.⁵⁵⁵

For Walton, these portraits were visual recordings of modern scientific achievements that held great appeal to a contemporary crowd. Yet he also described an apprehension felt by viewers before these works. By apprehension, did he mean that the paintings could be easily understood because they seemed like part of everyday life? Or did the 'unpictorial' subject matter provoke an apprehension - in the sense of an uneasiness - because the "old problems" represented in these paintings – disease, death and madness – remained despite, or because of, the application of "new methods"? Did the paintings' lack of excellent (obvious?) *facture* make them look too real?

Artists and doctors worked together to construct representations that were considered as truthful and objective as possible. Realist formal practices emerging from the art world intersected with modern science's authoritative claim to neutrality and reason in order to construct the 'truth' of bodies, diseases and sexualities. The desire to represent reality and identity was at the heart of the paintings by Edelfelt, Bonnat, Gsell, Gervex and Brouillet. It was also a primary concern of the men they represented, who wanted their masculinity, nationalism, social status and professional skills and discoveries to be on display. In order to construct a sense of reality, the Salon portraits had to appear

⁵⁵⁵ Walton, p. 88.

‘unpictorial’: theatrical light and fantastical compositions would have threatened the structured neutrality of the clinical scenes. Similarly, the images and objects created and commissioned by Pasteur, Péan and Charcot required aesthetic practices and mediums that were considered objective in order to contribute to their status as educational tools and accurate scientific documents.

Realistic representations of bodies in both artistic and medical spheres repulsed and delighted viewers by their life-like qualities. Even though such representations occasionally provoked “quick apprehension”, as Walton suggested, there was always a pleasure gained in the viewing of modern paintings with contemporary themes, particularly when spectacular elements, such as naked young women and foreign patients were included. As Chamillac wrote in his medically themed Salon review, despite the pain provoked by the “virus pictural”, one couldn’t live without it:

Il est vraiment heureux qu’annuellement la rude vaccine du Palais de l’Industrie terrible, mais indispensable, nous anesthésie d’un seul coup les yeux et le crâne; sans cela, que deviendrions-nous, misérable habitants de la Peintrapole, sans la perpétuelle avalanche du virus pictural éparpillé dans notre atmosphère?⁵⁵⁶

Chamillac’s review united the themes of vaccination, anesthetics and madness, positioning the Salon, like the Pasteur Institute, Hôpital Saint-Louis and the Salpêtrière, as sites in which the worlds of art and scientific medicine converged.

While medicine drew upon artistic conventions in order to construct bodies and sexualities as healthy or sick, Chamillac used scientific medical themes as a rhetorical filter through which modern paintings could be understood.

The representations of Pasteur, Péan and Charcot, along with the realistic representations of bodies that these men collected, constructed boundaries of difference between sickness and health, femininity and masculinity, reason and insanity, truth and deceit, reality and fiction. The binary opposites often repeated throughout this thesis point to the fluidity of mimetic representations, and show how processes of inclusion and exclusion were integral to the construction of sexualities, histories, identities, realities and physical states. Although medical men and artists emphasized the objectivity and reason of their realistic objects, whether in paint, wax, photography or print, pleasure and subjectivity were also a vital component of creating and collecting bodies.

⁵⁵⁶ Chamillac, p. 350.

Figures

Bibliography

Ackerknecht, Erwin Heinz. *Medicine at the Paris Hospital, 1794-1848*. Baltimore, 1967.

A.C. "Le Docteur Péan." *La Chronique Médicale – Revue bi-mensuelle de médecine, historique, littéraire et anecdotique*, 15 February, 1898, p. 8.

Agulhon, Maurice. *Marianne into Battle: Republican Imagery and Symbolism in France 1789-1880*. Cambridge, 1981.

Aisenberg, Andrew Robert. *Contagion: Disease, Government, and The "Social Question" In Nineteenth-Century France*. Stanford, 1999.

Alber. "Les Personnages en Cire." *La Nature*, 21, 1, 1894, p. 325.

Alberty. "A l'Institut Pasteur." *Le Voltaire*, 16 November, 1888, n. 22538. (Madame Pasteur's notebook, Musée Pasteur Archives)

A.P. "Echos de la Science." *La Revue Blanche*, 15 January 1886, n.p.

Arène, Emmanuel. "Chronique: de l'hypnotisme." *La République Française*, 30 April 1887, p. 2.

Armstrong, Carol. "Probing Pictures: Carol Armstrong on Georges Didi-Huberman – *Invention of Hysteria: Charcot and the Photographic Iconography of the Salpêtrière*." *Art Forum*, September 2003, online version, n.p.

Association Arbois-Pasteur. *Rappelez-Vous l'Arboisien - Pasteur, l'Artiste et Ses Amis Aristes*. Arbois, 1995.

Aubeau. *Des applications de la micrographie et de la bactériologie à la précision du diagnostic chirurgical*. Paris, 1884.

Aubeau. "La Psychologie de Péan." *La Chronique Médicale – Revue bi-mensuelle de médecine, historique, littéraire et anecdotique*, 15 February, 1898, pp. 106-108.

Aubenas, Sylvie. *L'art Du Nu Au XIXe Siècle: Le Photographe et Son Modèle*. Paris, 1997.

Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis. The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Translated by Willard Ropes. Princeton, 1953.

Auerbach, Nina. *Woman and the Demon: The Life of a Victorian Myth*. Cambridge, 1982.

"*Avant l'Opération: Tableau de M. Gervex (Salon de 1887)*." *Paris Illustré*, 28 May 1887, p. 76.

Azam, C. *Hypnotisme, Double Conscience, et Altérations De La Personnalité*. Paris, 1887.

- Bailey, Colin (ed). *Renoir's Portraits: Impressions of an Age*. New Haven, 1997.
- Ballu, Roger. "Salon de 1887." Supplement to *L'Illustration*, 30 April, 1887, n.2305., n.p.
- Bann, Stephen. *Parallel Lines: Printmakers, Painters and Photographers in Nineteenth-Century France*. New Haven, 2001.
- Baragnon, Louis. N. "Comment on devient un grand chirurgien. Les aptitudes artistique de Péan." *Chronique Médicale*, 15 February 1902, pp. 100-102.
- Baragnon, Louis. N. "La Médecine et l'Art – Toulouse-Lautrec chez Péan." *Chronique Médicale*, 15 February 1902, pp. 98-100.
- Barasch, Moshe. *Theories of Art from Winkelman to Baudelaire*. Volume II. New York, 2000.
- Barbier, Emile. "L'héritage du Docteur Mackinson – moeurs américains." *Figaro illustré*, October 1890, pp. 153-154.
- Barthes, Roland. *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*. Translated by Richard Howard. London, 1981.
- Bashford, Alison. *Purity and Pollution: Gender, Embodiment and Victorian Medicine*. New York, 1998.
- Bashkoff, Tracey R., Nancy Spector, and Hiroshi Sugimoto. *Sugimoto Portraits*. Exh. cat. New York, Guggenheim Museum, 2000.
- Bata, Philippe, Marie-Véronique Clin, et al., *André Brouillet 1857-1914*. Exh.cat. Poitiers Musée de la ville de Poitiers, 2000.
- Baudelaire, Charles. *The Painter of Modern Life and Other Essays*. Translated by Jonathan Mayne. London, 1964.
- Baudelaire, Charles. *Art in Paris, 1845-1862. Salons and other exhibitions*. Translated and edited by Jonathan Mayne. London, 1965.
- Baudelaire, Charles. *Oeuvres complètes*. 2 vols. Paris, 1975-1976.
- Baudouin, Marcel. *Guide médicale à l'exposition Universelle internationale de 1889 à Paris*. Paris, 1889.
- Baudouin, Marcel. "Les premières femmes médecins et internes." *La France Médicale – Revue d'études d'Histoire de la médecine*. Paris, 1906, pp. 260-261.
- Bauzon, Louis, Paul Berthelot, Paul Bonnefon, et al. *Artistes Contemporains des Pays de Guyenne, Béarn, Saintonge et Languedoc*. Bordeaux, 1889.

- Beaulieu, Jill, Toni Ross, and Mary Roberts. *Refracting Vision: Essays on the Writings of Michael Fried*. Sydney, 2000.
- Beizer, Janet. *Ventriloquized Bodies: Narratives of Hysteria in Nineteenth-Century France*. Ithaca, 1994.
- Bénédite, Léonce. *La Peinture au XIXe siècle d'après les chefs-d'oeuvres des maîtres et les meilleurs tableaux des principaux artistes*. Parid, n.d.
- Benjamin, Andrew. *Art, Mimesis and the Avant-Garde: Aspects of a Philosophy of Difference*. London, 1991.
- Berillon, Edgar. *Revue de l'hypnotisme expérimentale et thérapeutique*. Paris, 1887.
- Bernard, Denis, and Andre Gunthert. *L'instant rêve: Albert Londe*. Nîmes, 1993.
- Bernheimer, Charles. *Figures of Ill Repute: Representing Prostitution in Nineteenth-Century France*. Cambridge, 1989.
- Bernheimer, Charles, and Claire Kahane. *In Dora's Case: Freud--Hysteria--Feminism*. New York, 1985.
- Bertillon, Alphonse. *La photographie judiciaire*. Paris, 1890.
- Bianchon, Horace. *Nos Grands Médecins d'aujourd'hui*. Paris, 1891.
- Blanc, Charles. *L'école Hollandaise*. Paris, 1883.
- Blanchard, Raphaël. *Hommage à M. de Dr Paul Richer, member de l'Académie de Médecine, Professeur d'anatomie à l'école des Beaux-Arts, à l'occasion de son éléction à l'Académie des Beaux-Arts, 22 Juillet, 1905*. Paris, 1906.
- Blaze de Bury, Henri Baron. *Les Bonhommes De Cire*. Paris, 1864.
- Bolton, Richard. *The Contest of Meaning: Critical Histories of Photography*. Cambridge, 1989.
- Bouret, Jean. *Toulouse-Lautrec*. London, 1964.
- Bourneville, Désiré and Paul Régnaud. *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*. Paris, 1875.
- Bourneville, Désiré and Paul Régnaud. *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*. Paris, 1877.
- Bourneville, Désiré and Paul Régnaud. *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*. Paris, 1878.

Bourneville, Désiré and Paul Régnard. *Iconographie Photographique de la Salpêtrière*. Paris, 1879.

Bourneville, Désiré and Paul Régnard. "Les Phénomènes d'hypnotisme." *La Nature*, 9, 1, 1881 pp. 406-411.

Bourneville Désiré and Paul Régnard. "Les Phénomènes d'hypnotisme." *La Nature*, 9, 2, pp. 542-544.

Braun, Marta and Elizabeth Whitcombe. "Marey, Muybridge, and Londe: The Photography of Pathological Locomotion." *History of Photography*, 23, 3, Autumn 1999, pp. 218-224.

Brilliant, Richard. *Portraiture*. London, 2001.

Bronfen, Elisabeth. *Over Her Dead Body: Death, Femininity and the Aesthetic*. Manchester, 1992.

Bronfen, Elisabeth, and Sarah Webster Goodwin. *Death and Representation*. Baltimore, 1994.

Bronfen, Elisabeth. *The Knotted Subject: Hysteria and Its Discontents*. Princeton, 1998.

Bronfen, Elisabeth. "The Sexuality of Seeing." *Art History*, December 1990, 3, 4, pp. 576-580.

Brooks, Peter. *Body Work: Objects of Desire in Modern Narrative*. Cambridge, 1993.

Brooks, Peter. *Realist Vision*. New Haven, 2005.

Brouardel, Paul. *Le secret médical*. Paris, 1887.

Bryson, Norman, Michael Ann Holly and Keith Moxey (eds). *Visual Theory: Painting and Interpretation*. Cambridge, 1991.

Burais, A. "Applications de la photographie à la médecine." Doctoral Thesis in Medicine, Paris, 22 July 1896.

Burgess, R. *Portraits of Doctors and Scientists in the Wellcome Institute of the History of Medicine*. London, 1973,

Burns, Stanley. *Early medical photographs in America, 1839-1883*. New York, 1983.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York, 1990.

Butler, Judith. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits Of "Sex"*. New York, 1993.

Byerly, Alison. *Realism, Representation, and the Arts in Nineteenth-Century Literature*. Cambridge, 1997.

Bynum, W. F. *Science and the Practice of Medicine in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge, 1994.

Bynum, W. F., E. J. Browne, and Roy Porter. *Dictionary of the History of Science*. London, 1981.

Cahan, David. *From Natural Philosophy to the Sciences: Writing the History of Nineteenth-Century Science*. Chicago, 2003.

Callebat, Louis (ed). *Histoire de Médecine*. Paris. 1999.

Callen, Anthea. "The Body and Difference: Anatomy training at the École des Beaux-Arts in the later nineteenth century." *Art History*, 20, 1, March 1997, pp. 23-60.

Callen, Anthea. "Doubles and Desire: Anatomies of masculinity in the late nineteenth century." *Art History*, 26, 5, November 2003, pp. 669-699.

Callen, Anthea. *The Spectacular Body: Science, Method and Meaning in the Work of Degas*. New Haven, 1995.

Camille, Michael and Adrian Rifkin (eds). *Other Objects of Desire: Collectors and Collecting Queerly*. Oxford, 2001.

Cartaz, A. "Du somnambulisme et du magnétisme a propos du cours du Dr Charcot à la Salpêtrière." *La Nature*, 7 December 1878, pp. 102-106.

Cartaz, A. "La Rage: Traitement prophylactique de M. Pasteur." *La Nature*, 27 February 1886, pp. 211-214.

Cartwright, Lisa. *Screening the Body: Tracing Medicine's Visual Culture*. Minneapolis, 1995.

Castlemann, Riva and Wolfgang Wittrock (eds). *Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec: Images of the 1890s*. New York, 1985.

Cazalet, A. E. "The Moujik." *The Economic Journal*, 11, 44, December 1901, pp. 575-581.

Celebonovic, Aleksa, Sacha Tolstoi, and Peter Willis. *The Heyday of Salon Painting: Masterpieces of Bourgeois Realism*. London, 1974.

"Ce que l'hypnotisme peut fair." *Le Courrier Français*, 29 May, 1887, pp. 6-7.

Challons-Lipton, Siulolovao. *The Scandinavian Pupils of the Atelier Bonnat, 1867-1894*. Lewiston, 2001.

Chamillac. "Le Virus Pictural." *La Revue illustrée*, I, 1887, pp. 337-340 (Musée d'Orsay, 1887 Salon dossier).

Charcot, Jean-Martin. *Clinique des maladies du système nerveux*. 2 vol. Paris, 1892-1893.

Charcot, Jean-Martin and Paul Richer. *Les démoniaques dans l'art*. Paris, 1887.

Charcot, Jean-Martin and Paul Richer. *Les difformes et les maladies dans l'art*. Paris, 1889.

Charcot, Jean-Martin and Pierre Marie Janet, *Dictionary of Psychological Medicine*, London, 1892.

Charcot, Jean-Martin. *Leçons du mardi à la Salpêtrière. Policlinique 1887-1888. Notes de cours de M.M. Blin, Charcot et Colin*. Paris, 1888.

Charcot, Jean-Martin. *Leçons du mardi à la Salpêtrière. Policlinique 188-1889. Notes de cours de M.M. Blin, Charcot et Colin*. Paris, 1889.

Charcot, Jean-Martin. *Oeuvres complètes de J. M. Charcot. Leçons sur les maladies du système nerveux recueillies et publiées par Bourneville. Tome I*. Paris, 1892.

Charcot, Jean-Martin. *Oeuvres complètes de J. M. Charcot. Leçons sur les maladies du système nerveux recueillies et publiées par Bourneville. Tome II*. Paris, 1886.

Charcot, Jean-Martin. *Oeuvres complètes de J. M. Charcot. Leçons sur les maladies du système nerveux recueillies et publiées par MM. Babinski, Bernard, Féré, Guinon, Marie et Gilles de la Tourette. Tome III*. Paris, 1890.

Charlier. "Nécrologie de Charcot." *Revue de l'hypnotisme expérimentale et thérapeutique*, 8, 1894, p. 63.

Chenut, Helen Harden. *The Fabric of Gender: Working-Class Culture in Third Republic France*. University Park, 2005.

Chu, Petra ten-Doesschate. *French Realism and the Dutch Masters: The Influence of Dutch Seventeenth-Century Painting on the Development of French Painting between 1830 and 1870*. Utrecht, 1974.

Clair, Jean (ed). *L'âme Au Corps: Arts et Sciences 1793-1993*. Exh. cat. Paris, Grand Palais, 1993.

Claretie, Jules. *Les amours d'un interne*. Paris, 1881.

Clark, T. J. *The Absolute Bourgeois: Artists and Politics in France, 1848-1851*: London, 1973.

Clark, T. J. *The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and His Followers*. London, 1984.

Clarke, Graham. *The Portrait in Photography*. London, 1992.

- Clayson, Hollis. *Painted Love: Prostitution in French Art of the Impressionist Era*. New Haven, 1991.
- Clin, Marie-Véronique. *Musée d'histoire de la médecine de Paris*. Paris, 1984.
- Cohen, William B. "Malaria and French Imperialism." *The Journal of African History*, 24, 1, 1983, pp. 23-36.
- Comte, Jules. "Salon de 1886 – La Peinture." *L'illustration*, n. 2253, 1 May 1886, pp. 282-287.
- Congrès International de Photographie, tenu à Paris du 6 au 17 août 1889*. Paris, 1889.
- Corbin, Alain. *The Foul and the Fragrant: Odor and the French Social Imagination*. New York, 1986.
- Corbin, Alain. *Women for Hire: Prostitution and Sexuality in France after 1850*. Translated by Anne Sheridan. Cambridge, 1990.
- Crary, Jonathan. *Suspensions of Perception: Attention, Spectacle and Modern Culture*. Cambridge, 2001.
- Crary, Jonathan. *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge, 1990.
- Crissey, John Thorne, Lawrence Charles Parish, and Karl Holubar. *Historical Atlas of Dermatology and Dermatologists*. Carnforth, 2001.
- Crespi, J. H. "Pasteur at Home." *Gentleman's Magazine*, 286, 1911, March 1890, pp. 257-275.
- Cunningham, Andrew and Perry Williams (eds). *The Laboratory Revolution in Medicine*. Cambridge, 1992.
- Curtin, Philip D. *Death by Migration: Europe's Encounter with the Tropical World in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge, 1989.
- Curtin, Philip D. *Disease and Empire: The Health of European Troops in the Conquest of Africa*. Cambridge, 1998.
- Cuvier, Guy. *Félicien Rops*. Brussels, 1983.
- Daelen, Edouard. *La moralité du nu*. Paris, n.d.
- Dalligny, Aug. "Le Salon de 1886." *Le Journal des Arts*, 11 May 1886, n.p.
- Darenberg, Georges. *Les Grands Médecins du XIXe siècle*. Paris, 1907.
- Darcours, Charles. "Beaux-Arts et Théâtre." *Le Journal illustré*, 8 May 1887, p. 146.
- Darmon, Pierre. *Le Médecin Parisien en 1900*. Paris, 2003.

Dawkins, Heather. *The Nude in French Art and Culture, 1870-1910*. Cambridge, 2002.

de Beaulieu, C. *Le Salon de 1886*, published as a supplement to *La Gazette du Dimanche*, Paris, 1886.

de Bélinas, A. M-. *Nos Peintres Dessinés par eux-mêmes – notes humoristique et esquisses biographique*. Paris, 1883.

Decaisne, E. "Les expériences de M. Pasteur pour la preservation de la rage." *L'univers illustré*, 9 January 1886, pp. 38-39.

de Fourcaud, Louis. "Le Salon de 1887." *La Revue Illustré*, I, pp. 313 - 359.

de Fourcaud, Louis. "L'art contemporain – école français." *Revue de l'Exposition Universelle 1889*. Paris, 1889.

de la Tourette, Gilles. *L'hypnotisme et les états analogues au point de vue médico-legal*. Paris, 1887.

'De l'audace, encore de l'audace, toujours de l'audace': *La chirurgie hospitalière à Paris à la fin du XIXe siècle à travers une acquisition*. Exh. cat. Paris, Assistance Publique – Hôpitaux de Paris, 2000.

Delaunay, Albert and Hilda Benichou. *Pasteur Institute*. Paris, 1984.

De Pradel. "La névrose du siècle." *La Revue Blanche*, 15 May, 1886, pp. 157-158.

De Pradel. "La névrose du siècle (suite)." *La Revue Blanche*, 1 June 1886, pp. 175-177.

Le Dernier Portrait. Exh.cat. Paris, Musée d'Orsay, 2002.

de Lostalot, Alfred. "Le Salon de 1886: La Peinture." *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, Paris, 1886, pp. 456 – 459.

Desjardins, M. "A Travers Le Salon." *La République Française*, 30 April 1887, pp. 1-2.

Despieres, G. "Histoire de l'accession de la femme aux études médicales et plus particulièrement à Lyon." *Conférence d'histoire de la médecine à Lyon*, Lyon, 1984, pp. 51-70.

Devillers, Hippolyte. "Salon de Paris." *La Jeune Belgique*, VI, 7, 5 July 1887, pp. 232-237.

de Vogüé, Eugène-Melchior. "De la Littérature Réalistes – A propos du roman russe." *Revue des Deux Mondes*, May-June 1886, p. 289.

Dewamin, Emile. *Collection encyclopédique des notabilité du XIXe siècle*. Paris, 1901.

Didi-Huberman, Georges. *Confronting Images: Questioning the Ends of a Certain History of Art*. Translated by John Goodman. University Park, 2005.

Didi-Huberman, Georges. *Invention of Hysteria: Charcot and the Photographic Iconography of the Salpêtrière*. Cambridge, 2003.

Didi-Huberman, "Wax Flesh, Vicious Circles" in Petra Lamers-Schütz and Yvonne Havertz (eds), *Encyclopaedia Anatomica – A Complete Collection of Anatomical Waxes*, Cologne, 1999.

Dijkstra, Bram. *Idols of Perversity: Fantasies of Feminine Evil in Fin-De Siècle Culture*. New York, 1986.

Dixon, Laurinda S. *Perilous Chastity: Women and Illness in Pre-Enlightenment Art and Medicine*. Ithaca, 1995.

Dortu, M. G. *Toulouse-Lautrec et Son Oeuvre*. New York, 1971.

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London, 1966.

Downing, Lisa. *Desiring the Dead: Necrophilia and Nineteenth-Century French Literature*. Oxford, 2002.

D'Souza, Anna (ed). *Self and History: A Tribute to Linda Nochlin*. London, 2001.

Dubos, René J., and Thomas D. Brock. *Pasteur and Modern Science*. Madison, 1988.

Dubray, P. "Promenades au Salon." *Union Médicale*, 14 May 1887, pp. 753-759.

Duchenne de Boulogne, Guillaume-Benjamin. *De l'électrisation localisée et de son application à la pathologie et à la thérapeutique*. Paris, 1862.

Duchenne de Boulogne, Guillaume-Benjamin. *Mécanisme de la physionomie humaine ou analyse électrophysiologique de l'expression des passions*. Paris, 1862.

Ducourau, Vincent. *Léon Bonnat*. Bayonne, 1998.

Dufour, Philippe. *Le realism: De Balzac à Proust*. Paris, 1998.

Dumas, F.G. and L. de Fourcauld. *Revue de l'exposition universelle de 1889*. Paris, 1889.

Dumas, F.G. *Catalogue illustré des beaux-arts, 1789-1889*. Paris, 1889.

Duranty, Edmond. *La Nouvelle Peinture, à propos du Groupe d'artistes qui expose dans les Galeries Durand-Ruel*. M. Guérin (ed), Paris, 1946.

du Seigneur, Maurice. "Les Expositions Particulières en 1886." *L'Artiste*, 57, January 1887, pp. 65-71.

- Elkins, James. *Pictures of the Body: Pain and Metamorphosis*. Stanford, 1999.
- Elkins, James. *On Pictures and the Words that Fail Them*. Cambridge, 1998.
- Ellenberger, Henri F., and Mark S. Micale. *Beyond the Unconscious: Essays of Henri F. Ellenberger in the History of Psychiatry*. Princeton, 1993.
- Ellis, Jack D. *The Physician-Legislators of France: Medicine and Politics in the Early Third Republic, 1870-1914*. Cambridge, 1990.
- Elsner, John, and Roger Cardinal. *The Cultures of Collecting*. London, 1994.
- English, Donald E. *Political Uses of Photography in the Third French Republic, 1871-1914*. Ann Arbor, 1984.
- Evans, Martha Noel. *Fits and Starts: A Genealogy of Hysteria in Modern France*. Ithaca, 1991.
- Exposition Universelle de 1889 – Catalogue illustré des Beaux-Arts 1789-1889*. Lille, 1889.
- Falret, Jules. *Études cliniques sur les maladies mentales et nerveuse*. Paris, 1890.
- Farley, John. *Bilharzia: A History of Imperial Tropical Medicine*. Cambridge, 1991.
- Fend, Mechthild. "Bodily and Pictorial Surfaces: Skin in French Art and Medicine, 1790 – 1860." *Art History*, 28, 3, June 2005, pp. 311-339.
- Féré, Charles. "J.-M Charcot et son oeuvre." *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 March 1894, pp. 414-424.
- Fèvre, Henry. *Études sur le salon de 1886 et sur l'exposition des impressionists*. Paris, 1886.
- Fonsmark, Anne-Brigitte. *Manet, Gauguin, Rodin...Chef-d'oeuvre de la Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek de Copenhagen*. Exh. cat., Paris, Musée d'Orsay, 1996.
- Ford, Brian J. *Images of Science: A History of Scientific Illustration*. New York, 1993.
- Forrest, Derek William. *Hypnotism: A History*. London, 2000.
- Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. Translated by Richard Joseph Howard. London, 1967.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. Translated by Robert Hurley. London, 1979.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*. Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith. London, 1973.

Fournier, Alfred. *Traité de la syphilis. Rédigé d'après l'enseignement de l'Hôpital Saint-Louis*. Paris, 1889.

Fox, Robert, and George Weisz. *The Organization of Science and Technology in France 1808-1914*. Cambridge, 1980.

Fascina, Francis and Charles Harrison (eds). *Modern Art and Modernism: A Critical Anthology*. New York, 1982.

Freud, Sigmund. *The Uncanny*. Translated by David McLintock. London, 2003.

Freud, Sigmund. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, James Strachey (ed), volume III, London, 1962.

Freund, Gisele. *Photography and Society*. London, 1980.

Fried, Michael. *Absorption and Theatricality: Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot*. Berkeley, 1980.

Fried, Michael. *Realism, Writing, Disfiguration on Thomas Eakins and Stephen Crane*. Chicago, 1987.

Fried, Michael. *Manet's Modernism, or, the Face of Painting in the 1860s*. Chicago, 1996.

Fried, Michael. *Courbet's Realism*. Chicago, 1990.

Fried, Michael. *Menzel's Realism: Art and Embodiment in Nineteenth-Century Berlin*. New Haven, 2002.

Gallagher, Catherine, and Thomas Laqueur. *The Making of the Modern Body: Sexuality and Society in the Nineteenth Century*. Berkeley, 1987.

Gamwell, Lynn. *Exploring the Invisible: Art, Science and the Spiritual*. Princeton, 2002.

Ganderax, Louis. "Causerie sur le Salon." *La République Française*, 2 May 1886, n.p.

Ganderax, Louis. "Causerie sur Le Salon." *La République Française*, 10 June 1886, n.p.

Garb, Tamar. *Sisters of the Brush: Women's Artistic Culture in Late Nineteenth-Century Paris*. New Haven, 1994.

Garb, Tamar. *Bodies of Modernity: Figure and Flesh in fin-de-siècle France*. London, 1998.

Gaudot, Er. –Ch. *Pasteur entrevu dans l'image*. Besançon, 1895.

Gebauer, Gunter, and Christoph Wulf. *Mimesis: Culture, Art, Society*. Berkeley, 1995.

Geison, Gerald L. *The Private Science of Louis Pasteur*. Princeton, 1995.

Geison, Gerald L. (ed). *Professions and the French State, 1700 – 1900*. Philadelphia, 1984.

Gervex, Henri. *Souvenir: Henri Gervex recueilles par Jules Bertaut*. Paris, 1924.

Gilman, Sander L. *Seeing the Insane: A Cultural History of Madness and Art in the Western World*. New York, 1982.

Gilman, Sander L. *Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race, and Madness*. Ithaca, 1985.

Gilman, Sander L. *Disease and Representation: Images of Illness from Madness to Aids*. Ithaca, 1988.

Gilman, Sander L. *Freud, Race, and Gender*. Princeton, 1993.

Gilman, Sander L. *The Case of Sigmund Freud: Medicine and Identity at the fin-de-siècle*. Baltimore, 1993.

Gilman, Sander L, et al. *Hysteria Beyond Freud*. Berkeley, 1993.

Gilman, Sander L. *Health and Illness: Images of Difference, Picturing History*. London, 1995.

Gilman, Sander L. *Making the Body Beautiful: A Cultural History of Aesthetic Surgery*. Princeton, 1999.

Gluck, Mary. *Popular Bohemia: Modernism and Urban Culture in Nineteenth-Century Paris*. Cambridge, 2005.

Goldin, Grace. *Work of Mercy: A Picture History of Hospitals*. Boston, 1994.

Goldstein, Jan. *Console and Classify: The French Psychiatric Profession in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge, 1987.

Goldstein, Jan. "The hysterical Diagnosis and the Politics of Anticlericalism in late Nineteenth-Century France." *Journal of Modern History*, 54, 2, June 1982, pp. 209-239.

Goldstein, Jan, "The Uses of Male Hysteria: Medical and Literary Discourse in Nineteenth-Century France", *Representations*, Spring 1991, 0, 34, pp. 134-165.

Goodbody, Bridget L. "'The Present Opprobrium of Surgery': *The Agnew Clinic* and Nineteenth-Century Representations of Cancerous Female Breasts." *American Art*, Winter 1994, pp. 33-51.

Goodman, Nelson. *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols*. Indianapolis, 1976.

Gordon, C.A. *Comments on the Report of the Committee on M. Pasteur's Treatment of Rabies and Hydrophobia*. London, 1888.

Gould, Roger V. *Insurgent Identities: Class, Community, and Protest in Paris from 1848 to the Commune*. Chicago, 1995.

Grand Festival au profit de l'Institut Pasteur, organizer par la Conférence 'Scientia', Palais du Trocadéro, 11 May 1886. Paris, 1886.

Green, Nicholas. *The Spectacle of Nature: Landscape and Bourgeois Culture in Nineteenth-Century France*. Manchester, 1990.

Grosz, E. A. *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Bloomington, 1994.

Gsell, Paul. "Pasteur Intime." *Revue Encyclopédique*, 14 January 1895, pp. 19-22.

Guillain, Georges. *J.-M. Charcot, 1825-1893. His Life-His Work*. Translated by Pearce Bailey. London, 1959.

Guillain, Georges. *J.-M Charcot. Sa vie. Son oeuvre*. Paris, 1955.

Guillemot, Maurice. "À la Salpêtrière I." *Paris illustré*, 24 September 1887, pp. 354-355.

Guillemot, Maurice. "À la Salpêtrière II." *Paris illustré*, 1 October 1887, p. 371.

Guinon, Georges. *Les Agents Provocateur de l'hystérie*. Paris, 1889.

Gutman-Hanihivaara. "Edelfelt à Paris, l'itinéraire d'un artiste." *La revue du Musée d'Orsay*, 14, Spring 2002, p. 72.

Haeger, Knüt. *The Illustrated History of Surgery*. London, 1989.

Hahn, G. "Charcot et son influence sur l'opinion publique." *Revue des questions scientifiques*, July 1894, pp. 367-371.

Hamel, M. "Le Salon de 1887." *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 1887, p. 479.

Hannaway, Caroline and Ann Ed La Berge (eds). *Constructing Paris Medicine*. Amsterdam, 1998.

Hansen, Bert. "America's First Medical Breakthrough: How Popular Excitement about a French Rabies Cure in 1885 Raised New Expectations for Medical Progress." *The American Historical Review*, 103, 2, April 1998, pp. 373-418.

Hardy, Alfred and A. de Montmeja. *Clinique Photographique de l'Hôpital Saint-Louis*. Paris, 1868.

Hargrove, June Ellen, and Neil McWilliam (eds). *Nationalism and French Visual Culture, 1870-1914*. New Haven, 2005.

Harrington, Anne. *Medicine, Mind, and the Double Brain: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Thought*. Princeton, 1987.

Harris, Ruth. *Murders and Madness: Medicine, Law, and Society in the Fin De Siècle*. Oxford, 1989.

Harrison, Charles and Paul Wood. *Art in Theory, 1815-1900*. Oxford, 1998.

Harsin, Jill. "Gender, Class and Madness in Nineteenth-Century France." *French Historical Studies*, 17, 4, Autumn 1992, pp. 1048-1070.

Harsin, Jill. *Policing Prostitution: In Nineteenth-Century Paris*. Princeton, 1985.

Harsin, Jill. "Syphilis, Wives, and Physicians: Medical Ethics and the Family in late Nineteenth-Century France." *French Historical Studies*, Spring 1989, 16, 1, pp. 72-95.

Havard, Henry. "Le Salon de 1887." *Le Siècle*, 14 May 1887, n.p.

Hawthorne, Melanie. *Rachilde and French Women's Authorship: From Decadence to Modernism*. Lincoln, 2001.

Henri Gervex, 1852-1929. Exh. cat. Bordeaux, Galerie Beaux-Arts, 1992.

Hildreth, Martha L. *Doctors, Bureaucrats, and Public Health in France, 1888-1902*. New York, 1987.

Hillier, Mary. *The History of Wax Dolls*. London, 1985.

Hintze, Bertel. "Albert Edelfelt", unpublished manuscript in the Pasteur Institute archives, Edelfelt Dossier.

Hirschler, J. *Nos Docteurs*. Paris, 1896.

Hobbs, Richard. *Impressions of French Modernity: Art and Literature in France, 1850-1900*. Manchester, 1998.

Hollier, Denis, and R. Howard Bloch. *A New History of French Literature*. Cambridge, 1989.

Holmes, Diana. *Rachilde: Decadence, Gender and the Woman Writer*. Oxford, 2001.

Hopwood, Nick. *Embryos in Wax : Models from the Ziegler Studio*. Cambridge, 2002.

L'horizon inconnu: L'art du Finlande 1870-1920. Exh.cat. Strasbourg, Musées de Strasbourg, 1999.

Houssaye, Arsène. "Le Salon de 1877." *L'Artiste*, June 1877, pp. 417-444.

Huet, Marie-Hélène. *Monstrous Imagination*. Cambridge, 1993.

Ignotus, Félix Platel. *Les Hommes de mon temps*. Paris, c. 1889.

Inauguration de l'Institut Pasteur. Paris. 1888.

"Inauguration de l'Institut Pasteur." *Le Soir*, 19 November 1888, n.p.

"Inauguration de l'Institut Pasteur." *L'Univers illustré*, 24 November 1888, p. 742.

"L'influence de l'aimant dans l'hypnotisme." *L'illustration*, 22 January 1887, pp. 66-67.

Iversen, Margaret. *Alois Riegl: Art History and Theory*. Cambridge, 1993.

Iverson, Margaret, et al. *Mary Kelly*. London, 1997.

Janet, J. "L'hystérie et l'hypnotisme d'après la théorie de la double personnalité." *Revue Scientifique*, 3, 46, 1888, pp. 616-623.

Janet, P. "J.-M. Charcot, son oeuvre psychologique." *Revue Philosophique*, October 1894, pp. 572-577.

Janet, Pierre Marie Félix, and Caroline Rollin Corson. *The Mental State of Hystericals*. Translated by Caroline R. Corson. New York, 1901.

Janicot, J. "Inauguration de l'Institut Pasteur." *Le Figaro*, 15 November 1888, n.p.

Jansen, M. *Congrès International de Photographie*. Paris, 1889.

Javel, Firmin. "Le Salon." *L'Art Français*, 1 May 1887, n.p.

Joffroy, M. "Jean Martin Charcot (1825-1893)." *Archives de Médecine expérimentale et d'Anatomie Pathologiques*, 1893, 5, pp. 27-28.

Johns, Elizabeth. *Thomas Eakins: The Heroism of Modern Life*. Princeton, 1983.

Jonas, S. *Cent portraits de médecins illustres*. Paris, 1960.

Jones, Colin, and Roy Porter. *Reassessing Foucault: Power, Medicine, and the Body*. London, 1994.

Jordanova, L. J. *Defining Feature: Scientific and Medical Portraits, 1660-2000*. London, 2000.

Jordanova, L. J. *History in Practice*. London, 2000.

Jordanova, L. J. *Nature Displayed: Gender, Science and Medicine 1760-1820*. London, 1999.

Jordanova, L. J. *Sexual Visions: Images of Gender in Science and Medicine between the Eighteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. London, 1989.

- Jordanova, Ludmilla. "Reading Faces in the Nineteenth Century." *Art History*, December 1990, 3, 4, pp. 570-575.
- Joyant, Maurice. *Henri De Toulouse-Lautrec, 1864-1901*. Paris, 1926.
- Kahane, Claire. *Passions of the Voice: Hysteria, Narrative, and the Figure of the Speaking Woman, 1850-1915*. Baltimore, 1995.
- Kelly, Mary. *Mary Kelly: Interim*. Edinburgh, 1986.
- Kemp, Martin, and Marina Wallace. *Spectacular Bodies: The Art and Science of the Human Body from Leonardo to Now*. Ext. cat. London, Hayward Gallery, 2000.
- Kendall, Richard, et al. *Degas and the Little Dancer*. New Haven, 1998.
- Komesaroff, Paul A. *Troubled Bodies: Critical Perspectives on Postmodernism, Medical Ethics, and the Body*. Durham, 1995.
- Krauss, Rosalind. "Tracing Nadar." *October*, 5, summer 1978, pp. 29-47.
- Kromm, Jane. "'Marianne' and the Madwoman." *Art Journal*, 46, 4, Winter 1987, pp. 299-304.
- Labarthe, Paul. *Nos médecins contemporains*. Paris, 1868.
- La Berge, Ann F. *Mission and Method: The Early Nineteenth-Century French Public Health Movement*. Cambridge, 1992.
- La Berge, Ann F., and Mordechai Feingold. *French Medical Culture in the Nineteenth Century*. Amsterdam, 1994.
- Lafenestre, Georges. "1887 Salon." *Revue des Deux Mondes*. 81, 1 June 1887, p. 586.
- Lafenestre, Georges. "Le Salon." *Revue des Deux Mondes*, May-June 1886, 125, pp. 580-609.
- Lambert, Paul. *Le Salon de 1886*. Paris, 1886.
- Laqueur, Thomas Walter. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge, 1990.
- Larousse, Pierre. *Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIXieme siècle, I*. Paris, 1866.
- Larousse, Pierre. *Grand dictionnaire universelle du XIXe siècle, II*. Paris, 1867.
- Lathers, Marie. *Bodies of Art: French Literary Realism and the Artist's Model*. Lincoln, 2001.
- Latour, Bruno. *The Pasteurization of France*. Cambridge, 1988.

Latour, Bruno, and Steve Woolgar. *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts*. Princeton, 1986.

Le Breton, Gaston. "Essai Historique sur la Sculpture en Cire" in *Précis Analytique des Travaux de l'Académie des Sciences, Belles-Lettres et Arts de Rouen Pendant l'année 1891-1892*. Paris, 1893, pp. 250-303.

Lecaplain, M. "Discours de Reception" in *Précis Analytique des Travaux de l'Académie des Sciences, Belles-Lettres et Arts de Rouen Pendant l'année 1891-1892*. Paris, 1893, pp. 9-24.

Leclercq, Émile. *L'art est Rationnel*. Brussels, 1882.

Leclercq, Émile. *Caractères de l'École française moderne de peinture*. Brussels, 1881.

Leclercq, Julien. *La Physionomie, visages et caractères*. Paris, 1896.

Le Garrec, Yvonne. "Le 'Laboratoire de Pasteur' par L.L Gsell au Musée de Vannes." *Association des Anciens élèves de l'Institut Pasteur*, newsletter 2001, pp. 56-58.

Lehning, James R. *To Be a Citizen: The Political Culture of the Early French Third Republic*. Ithaca, 2001.

Lellouch, Alain. *Jean Martin Charcot et les origines de la gériatrie*. Paris, 1992.

Lemagny, Jean-Claud and André Rouillé. *A History of Photography: Social and Cultural Perspectives*. Translated by Janet Lloyd. Cambridge, 1987.

Lemaistre, Alexis. *L'institut de France et nos grands établissements scientifiques*. Paris, 1896.

Lenoir, Paul. "Salon de 1887." *L'Art*, 42, 1887, p. 209.

Lenoir, Paul. *Histoire du Réalisme et du Naturalisme dans la poésie et dans l'art depuis l'antiquité jusqu'à nos jours*. Paris, 1889.

Léonard, Jacques. *La France Médicale: Médecins et Malades au XIX^{ème} Siècle*. Paris, 1878.

Lépine, Olivier. *Équivoques: Peintures françaises du XIX^e siècle*. Exh. cat. Paris, Musée des Arts Décoratifs, 1973.

Leroi, Paul. "Le Salon de 1887." *L'Art*, 42, 1887, p. 209.

le Roux, Hugues. "La Vie à Paris: A Travers le Salon." *Le Temps*, 30 April, 1887, n.p.

Leterrier, Edouard. *André Brouillet*. Vienna, 1928.

- Levillain, Fernand. "Charcot et l'école de la Salpêtrière." *Revue Encyclopédique*, 78, 4, March 1891, pp. 111-114.
- Levin, Miriam R. *Republican Art and Ideology in Late Nineteenth Century France*. Ann Arbor, 1986.
- Levine, George. *Realism and Representation: Essays on the Problem of Realism in Relation to Science, Literature, and Culture, Science and Literature*. Madison, 1993.
- Liégeois, J. *De la Suggestion et du Somnambulisme dans les rapports avec la Jurisprudence et la Médecine-Légale*. Paris, 1889.
- Loir, Adrian. *À l'Ombre de Pasteur*. Paris, 1938.
- Londe, Albert. "La Photographie dans les sciences médicales." *La Nature*, 1893, 21, 2, pp. 370-374.
- Londe, Albert. *La photographie dans les arts, les sciences et l'industrie*. Paris, 1888.
- Londe, Albert. *La photographie instantanée. Théorie et pratique*. Paris, 1886.
- Londe, Albert. *La photographie médicale*. Paris, 1892.
- Londe, Albert. *La photographie moderne. Pratique et applications*. Paris, 1888.
- Lorber, Judith. *Gender and the Social Construction of Illness*. London, 1997.
- Loyrette, Henri. "Henri Gervex: Vindicating a Sullied Reputation." *Apollo*, May 1993, 137, 375, pp. 316-317.
- Lupton, Deborah. *Medicine as Culture: Illness, Disease and the Body in Western Societies*. London, 1994.
- Lutaud, M. *Pasteur et la rage*. Paris, 1887.
- Luxenberg, Alisa. "Léon Bonnat (1833-1922)." PhD Dissertation, New York University, 1990.
- Mack, Gerstle. *Toulouse-Lautrec*. London, 1938.
- Mackaman, Douglas Peter. *Leisure Settings: Bourgeois Culture, Medicine, and the Spa in Modern France*. Chicago, 1998.
- Mainardi, Patricia. *Art and Politics of the Second Empire: The Universal Expositions of 1855 and 1867*. New Haven, 1987.
- Mainardi, Patricia. *The End of the Salon: Art and the State in the Early Third Republic*. Cambridge, 1993.

- Maindron, Ernest. "Une Caricature sur la découverte de la Vaccine – Jenner – M. Pasteur." *La Nature*, 14, 2, p. 160.
- Mantz, Paul. "Le Salon – I." Supplement to *Le Temps*, 8 May 1887, n.p.
- Marc, L. "Le Docteur Péan." *L'illustration*, 31 December 1887, p. 480.
- Martin, Alexis. "Guide du Visiteur – la peinture et la sculpture au Salon de 1887." Supplement to *La Gazette des Femmes*, 10 May 1887.
- Martin, Marc. *Trois Siècle de publicité en France*. Paris, 1992.
- Marx, Adrien. "M. Pasteur et le Docteur Peter." *Le Figaro*, 23 January 1887, n. 22.515, n.p. (Madame Pasteur's notebook, Musée Pasteur Archives)
- Matlock, Jann. *Scenes of Seduction: Prostitution, Hysteria, and Reading Difference in Nineteenth-Century France*. New York, 1994.
- Maubry, Victorien. "Le Salon." *Le Témoin*, 16 May, 1887, pp. 41-42.
- Mayeur, Jean-Marie, and Madeleine Rebérioux. *The Third Republic from Its Origins to the Great War, 1871-1914*. Cambridge, 1984.
- McGrath, Roberta. *Seeing Her Sex: Medical Archives and the Female Body*. Manchester, 2002.
- McMillan, James F. "Clericals, Anticlericals and the Women's Movement in France under the Third Republic." *The Historical Journal*, June 1981, 24, 2, pp. 361-376.
- McPherson, Heather. *The Modern Portrait in Nineteenth-Century France*. Cambridge, 2000.
- McQueen, Alison. *The Rise of the Cult of Rembrandt: Reinventing an Old Master in Nineteenth-Century France*. Amsterdam, 2003.
- McQuillan, Melissa. *Impressionist Portraits*. London, 1986.
- Meige, Henri. "Charcot Artiste." *Apollon*, 17, 1929, pp. 41-53.
- Melberg, Arne. *Theories of Mimesis, Literature, Culture*. Cambridge, 1995.
- Mercutio, "Causerie." *La Revue Blanche, petit revue artistique, littéraire et scientifique*, 15 April, 1886, n.p.
- Merson, Olivier. "Le Salon." *Le Monde Illustré*, 30 April, 1887, p. 282.
- Merson, Olivier. "Le Salon." *Le Monde Illustré*, 14 May, 1887, p. 315-316.
- Meurville. "Le Salon - La Nature au Salon." Supplement to *Gazette de France*, 27 Mai 1887, XII.

- Meurville. "Le Salon – Le Nu." Supplement to *Gazette de France*, 7 June 1887, XVI, n.p.
- Meurville. "Le Salon – Le Nu." Supplement to *Gazette de France*, 8 June 1887, XVII, n.p.
- Meurville. "Le Salon – Portraits." Supplement to *Gazette de France*, 25 May 1887, XI, n.p.
- Merrick, Jeffrey W., and Bryant T. Ragan. *Homosexuality in Modern France, Studies in the History of Sexuality*. New York, 1996.
- Micale, Mark S. *Approaching Hysteria: Disease and Its Interpretations*. Princeton, 1995.
- Micale, Mark S., "Charcot and the Idea of Hysteria in the Male." *Medical History*, 34, 1990, pp. 363-411.
- Micale, Mark S., and Roy Porter. *Discovering the History of Psychiatry*. New York, 1994.
- Micale, Mark S., "Hysteria and its historiography – A Review of Past and Present Writing." *History of Science*, vol. 27, 1989, pp. 223-261.
- Micale, Mark S. *The Mind of Modernism: Medicine, Psychology, and the Cultural Arts in Europe and America, 1880-1940*. Stanford, 2004.
- Micale, Mark S., "On the 'Disappearance' of Hysteria: A Study in the Clinical Deconstruction of a Diagnosis." *Isis*, September 1993, 84, 3, pp. 496-526.
- Micale, Mark S., "The Salpêtrière in the Age of Charcot: An Institutional Perspective on Medical History in the Late Nineteenth-Century." *Journal of Contemporary History*, October 1985, 20, 4, pp. 703-731.
- Michel, Emile. *Rembrandt: Sa Vie, Son Oeuvre et Son Temps*. Paris, 1893.
- Mirzoeff, Nicholas. *The Visual Culture Reader*. London, 1998.
- Montroisier, Eugène. *Peintres Modernes: Ingres, H. Flandrin, Robert-Fleury*. Paris, 1882.
- Morgan, Jayne. "Eadweard Muybridge and W. S. Playfair: An Aesthetics of Neurasthenia." *History of Photography*, 23, 3, Autumn 1999, pp. 225-231.
- "Mort de Charcot." *Journal de médecine et de chirurgie pratique*, September 1893, pp. 642-643.
- "La Mort de M. le Professeur Charcot." *Revue de l'hypnotisme expérimentale et thérapeutique*. 8, 1984, p. 34.
- Mulvey, Laura. *Visual and Other Pleasures, Theories of Representation and Difference*. Bloomington, 1989.

- Murphy, Gail. *Toulouse-Lautrec: The Formative Years 1878-1891*. Oxford, 1991.
- Natanson, T. *Un Henri De Toulouse-Lautrec*. Genève, 1951.
- Nead, Lynda. *Female Nude: Art, Obscenity and Sexuality*. London, 1992.
- Nicole-Genty, G., M. Chapuis, J. Chapuis, et al. *Première femmes médecin en France*. Exh. cat. Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Académie nationale de médecine, 1976.
- Nicolle, Marcel. *Rembrandt Aux Expositions d'Amsterdam et de Londres*. Paris, 1899.
- Nochlin, Linda. *Realism*. New York, 1971.
- Nochlin, Linda. *Representing Women*. London, 1999.
- Nochlin, Linda. *Women, Art, and Power: And Other Essays*. New York, 1988.
- Nochlin, Linda. *The Politics of Vision: Essays on Nineteenth-Century Art and Society*. London, 1989.
- Nochlin, Linda. *The Body in Pieces: The Fragment as a Metaphor of Modernity*. London, 1994.
- Nord, Philip. "The Welfare State in France, 1870-1914." *French Historical Studies*, 18, 3, Spring 1994, pp. 821-838.
- Nye, Robert A. *Crime, Madness, and Politics in Modern France: The Medical Concept of National Decline*. Princeton, 1984.
- Nye, Robert A. *Masculinity and Male Codes of Honor in Modern France*. New York, 1993.
- "Les Obsèques de Pasteur." *République Française*, 6 October, 1895, n.p.
- O'Connor, Erin. "Camera Medica: Towards a Morbid History of Photography." *History of Photography*, 23, 3, Autumn 1999, pp. 232-244.
- Offen, Karen. "Depopulation, Nationalism, and Feminism in Fin-de-Siècle France." *The American Historical Review*, June 1984, pp. 648-679.
- Olin, Margaret. *Forms of Representation in Alois Riegl's Theory of Art*. University Park, 1992.
- Olmer, Georges. *Salon de 1886*. Paris, 1886.
- Ollendorf, Georges. *Salon de 1887*. Paris, 1887.
- Orwicz, Michael R. *Art Criticism and Its Institutions in Nineteenth-Century France*. Manchester, 1994.

Owen, A.R.G. *Hysteria, Hypnosis and Healing: The Work of J.-M Charcot*. London, 1971.

Papet, Edouard, Stephen Freeke, et al. *À fleur de peau – Le moulage sur nature au XIXe siècle*. Exh. cat. Paris, Musée d'Orsay, 2001.

Parruchot, Henri. *La vie de Toulouse-Lautrec*. Paris, 1958.

Pasteur, Louis. *Correspondance, 1840-1895, réunie et annoté par Pasteur Vallery-Radot*. Paris, 1940.

Pasteur, Louis. *Correspondance, 1877-1884*. III. Paris, 1951.

Pasteur, Louis. *Études sur la Bière; ses maladies, causes qui les provoquent, procédé pour la rendre inalterable, avec une théorie nouvelle de la Fermentation*. Paris, 1876.

Pasteur, Louis. *Jubilée de M. Pasteur*. Paris, 1893.

Pasteur, Louis. *Le Traitement de la rage*. Paris, 1886.

Pasteur, Louis. *Quelques réflexions sur la Science en France*. Paris, 1871.

Pecker, André (ed). *La médecine à Paris au XIIIe au XXe siècle*. Paris, 1984.

Pedersen, Jean Elisabeth. "Regulating Abortion and Birth Control: Gender, Medicine, and Republican Politics in France, 1870-1920." *French Historical Studies*, 19, 3, Spring 1996, pp. 673-698.

Pelca, G. "L'Institut Pasteur." *Le Gaulois*, 15 November 1888, n. 22.538. (Madame Pasteur's notebook, Musée Pasteur Archives)

Pernick, Martin S. *A Calculus of Suffering: Pain, Professionalism, and Anesthesia in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York, 1985.

Petherbridge, Deanna, and L. J. Jordanova. *The Quick and the Dead: Artists and Anatomy*. London, 1998.

Petrey, Sandy. *In the Court of the Pear King: French Culture and the Rise of Realism*. Ithaca, 2005.

Pilbeam, Pamela M. *Madame Tussaud and the History of Waxworks*. London, 2003.

Pitres, A. *Leçons cliniques sur l'hystérie et l'hypnotisme faites à l'hôpital Saint-André de Bordeaux*. Bordeaux, 1891.

Pointon, Marcia, and Kathleen Adler (eds). *The Body Imaged: The Human Form and Visual Culture since the Renaissance*. Cambridge, 1993.

Pointon, Marcia R. *Naked Authority: The Body in Western Painting, 1830-1908*. Cambridge, 1990.

- Pollock, Griselda. *Differencing the Canon: Feminist Desire and the Writing of Art's Histories*. London, 1999.
- Ponsonailhe, Charles. "Salon de 1886." *L'Artiste*, June 1886, pp. 401-484.
- Ponsonhailhe, Charles. "Le Salon." *L'Artiste*, July 1887, pp. 19-49.
- Porter, Roy. *A Social History of Madness: Stories of the Insane*. Weidenfeld, 1987.
- Porter, Roy. *The Cambridge Illustrated History of Medicine*. Cambridge, 1996.
- Porter, Roy. *The Greatest Benefit to Mankind : A Medical History of Humanity from Antiquity to the Present*. London, 1999.
- Porter, Roy. *Blood and Guts: A Short History of Medicine*. London, 2002.
- Porter, Roy, and Dorothy Porter. *In Sickness and in Health: The British Experience 1650-1850*. London, 1988.
- Porter, Roy. *Madmen: A Social History of Madhouses, Mad Doctors & Lunatics*. Stroud, 2004.
- Portraits of a Marriage – Marie and P.S Kroyer*. Exh. cat. Denmark, Skagens Museum, 1997.
- Prendergast, Christopher. *The Order of Mimesis: Balzac, Stendhal, Nerval, Flaubert*. Cambridge, 1986.
- Price, Roger. *A Social History of Nineteenth-Century France*. London, 1987.
- Pringle, John James, Alfred Fournier, et al. *A Pictorial Atlas of Skin Diseases and Syphilitic Affections in Photo-Lithochromes from Models in the Museum of the Saint Louis Hospital, Paris*. London, 1895.
- Proust, Antonin. *L'art français 1789-1889*. Paris, c. 1889.
- Rachilde. *Monsieur Venus*. Translated by Melanie Hawthorne. Sawtry, 1992.
- Rameau, Alexandre. "L'institut Pasteur." *La Science illustré*, 15 December 1888, pp. 33-35.
- Richardson, Ruth. *Death, Dissection and the Destitute*. Chicago, 1987.
- Richer, Paul. *Études cliniques sur la grande hystérie ou hystéro-épilepsie*. Paris, 1881.
- Reigl, Alois. *The Dutch Group Portrait*. Vienna, 1931.
- Ritzenthaler, Cécil. *L'école des Beaux-Arts du XIXe siècle – Les Pompiers*. Paris, 1982.

Robin-Massé, P. "La morte de Péan." *La chronique médicale – Revue bi-mensuelle de médecine*, 15 February 1989, pp. 98-103.

Roger-Milés, L., and Rene François Armand Sully-Prudhomme. *La Cité De Misère*. Paris, 1891.

Roquebert, Anne. *Le Paris de Toulouse-Lautrec*. Exh. cat. Paris, Musée d'Orsay, 1992.

Roscoe, Henry E. *The Life Work of a Chemist: An address delivered in the town hall, Birmingham, on the seventh October 1889*. Birmingham, 1889.

Rose, Jacqueline. *Sexuality in the Field of Vision*. London, 1986.

Roth, Nancy L., and Katie Hogan. *Gendered Epidemic: Representations of Women in the Age of Aids*. New York, 1998.

Rothfield, Lawrence. *Vital Signs: Medical Realism in Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. Princeton, 1992.

Rouillé, André. *Le corps et son image: Photographie du dix-neuvième siècle*. Paris, 1986.

Rouillé, André. *L'empire de la photographie: Photographie et pouvoir bourgeois, 1839-1870*. Paris, 1982.

Sagne, Jean. *Toulouse-Lautrec*. Paris, 1988.

"Salon de 1886." *L'Art*, 14 June 1886, p. 251.

"Le Salon de 1886." *L'Art Moderne*, 23 May 1886, p. 163.

"Le Salon de Peinture." *Le journal des arts*, 11 May 1886, n.p.

"Le Salon de 1886." *Le journal des arts*, 26 May, 1886, n.p.

"Le Salon." *Le journal des arts*, 3 June, 1887, p. 2.

"Le Salon." *Le journal des arts*, 10 June 1887, p. 1.

"Le Salon de 1887." *Le monde illustré*, 14 May 1887, n.p.

"Le Salon." *L'univers illustré*, 7 May, 1887, pp. 291-295.

Sawday, Jonathan. *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture*. New York, 1995.

Schapiro, Meyer. *Impressionism: Reflections and Perceptions*. New York, 1997.

Schalk, David L. "Tying up the Loose Ends of an Epoch: Zola's Docteur Pascal." *French Historical Studies*, 16, 1, Spring 1989, pp. 203-205.

- Schnalke, Thomas. *Diseases in Wax: The History of the Medical Moulage*. Berlin, 1995.
- Schehr, Lawrence R. *Rendering French Realism*. Stanford, 1997.
- Schor, Naomi. *Breaking the Chain: Women, Theory and French Realist Fiction, Gender and Culture*. New York, 1985.
- Schor, Naomi. *Reading in Detail: Aesthetics and the Feminine*. London, 1987.
- Schultheiss, Katrin. *Bodies and Souls: Politics and the Professionalization of Nursing in France, 1880-1922*. Cambridge, 2001.
- Schupbach, William. *Paradox of Rembrandt's Anatomy of Dr Tulp*. London, 1982.
- Schwartz, Vanessa R. "Museums and Mass Spectacle: The Musée Grévin as Monument to Modern Life." *French Historical Studies*, 19, 1, Spring 1995, pp. 7-26.
- Schwartz, Vanessa R. *Spectacular Realities: Early Mass Culture in Fin-De-Siècle Paris*. Berkeley, 1998.
- Sekula, Alan. "The Body and the Archive." *October*, 39, Winter 1986, pp. 3-64.
- Seymour, Lucy Ridgely. *A General History of Nursing*. London, 1961.
- Shapiro, Ann-Louise. *Breaking the Codes: Female Criminality in Fin-De-Siècle Paris*. Stanford, 1996.
- Shaw, Jennifer L. *Dream States: Puvis De Chavannes, Modernism and the Fantasy of France*. New Haven, 2002.
- Shaw, Jennifer L. "The Figure of Venus: Rhetoric of the Ideal and the Salon of 1863." *Art History*, December 1991, 14, 4, pp. 540-570.
- Showalter, Elaine. *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and Culture in England, 1830-1980*. New York, 1986.
- Showalter, Elaine. *Sexual Anarchy: Gender and Culture at the Fin De Siècle*. London, 1990.
- Showalter, Elaine. *Hystories: Hysterical Epidemics and Modern Culture*. London, 1997.
- Signoret, J.L. "Une Leçon Clinique a la Salpêtrière (1887) par André Brouillet." *Revue Neurologique*, 139, 12, 1983, pp. 687-701.
- Silverman, Debora Leah. *Art Nouveau in Fin-De-Siècle France: Politics, Psychology, and Style*. Berkeley, 1989.
- Simonin, Amédée H. *Solution du problème de la suggestion hypnotique: La Salpêtrière et l'hypnotisme, la suggestion criminelle, la Loi doit intervenir*. Paris, 1889.

- Sinding, Christiane. "Claude Bernard and Louis Pasteur: Constructing images through Public Commemorations." *Osiris*, 2, 14, 1999, pp. 61-85.
- Solomon-Godeau. *Male Trouble: A Crisis in Representation*. London, 1997.
- Sontag, Susan. *On Photography*. New York, 1971.
- Souques, A. "Charcot intime." *Presse médicale*, 1925, 4, pp. 693-698.
- Sournia, Jean-Charles. *Histoire de la médecine et des médecins*. Paris, 1991.
- Spongberg, Mary. *Feminizing Venereal Disease: The Body of the Prostitute in Nineteenth-Century Medical Discourse*. New York, 1997.
- Stafford, Barbara Maria. *Body Criticism: Imaging the Unseen in Enlightenment Art and Medicine*. Cambridge, 1991.
- Sterling, Charles. *Expositions des Collections Artistique de la Faculté de Médecine de Paris*. Paris, 1935.
- Stevens, Arthur. "De la modernité dans l'art." *L'art moderne*, 10 May 1886, n.p.
- Stewart, Mary Lynn. *For Health and Beauty: Physical Culture for Frenchwomen, 1880s-1930s*. Baltimore, 2001.
- Suleiman, Susan R. *The Female Body in Western Culture: Contemporary Perspectives*. Cambridge, 1986.
- Surkis, Judith. "Review of Didi-Huberman", *H-France Review*, 4, 4 January 2004.
- Suzor, J.-R. *Exposé Pratique du traitement de la rage par la méthode Pasteur*. Paris, 1888.
- Tagg, John. *The Burden of Representation: Essays on Photographies and Histories*. Basingstoke, 1988.
- Tagg, John. *Grounds of Dispute: Art History, Cultural Politics and the Discursive Field*. Basingstoke, 1992.
- Tagg, John. "Power and photography: part one, a means of surveillance: the photograph as evidence in law." *Screen Education*, 36, winter 1980, pp 17-55.
- Taithe, Bertrand. *Defeated Flesh: Welfare, Warfare and the Making of Modern France*. Manchester, 1999.
- Tapié de Celeyran, Gabriel. "H. de Toulouse-Lautrec et ses relations médicales." *La Chronique Médicale*, 1 December 1922, p. 357.
- Terry, Jennifer, and Jacqueline Urla. *Deviant Bodies: Critical Perspectives on Difference in Science and Popular Culture, Race, Gender, and Science*. Bloomington, 1995.

- Thomson, Richard. *Toulouse-Lautrec*. London, 1977.
- Thomson, Richard. *Toulouse-Lautrec*. Exh. cat. London, Hayward Gallery, 1992.
- Thomson, Richard. *The Troubled Republic: Visual Culture and Social Debate in France, 1889-1900*. New Haven, 2004.
- Thomson, Richard, Phillip Dennis Cate, and Mary Weaver Chapin. *Toulouse-Lautrec and Montmartre*. Exh. cat. Washington, National Gallery of Art, 2005.
- Thoré, Théophile. *Musées de la Hollande: I Amsterdam et la Haye-Etudes sur l'école hollandaise, II Musée van der Hoop à Amsterdam, et Musée de Rotterdam*. Paris, 1858 and 1860.
- Thoré, Théophile. *Salon de Théophile Thoré 1844, 1845, 1847, 1848*. Paris, 1868.
- Thuillier, Jean. *Monsieur Charcot de la Salpêtrière*. Paris, 1993.
- Tilles, Gérard. "Histoire des bibliothèques médicales et des musées des hôpitaux de l'Assistance publique. L'exemple de l'hôpital Saint-Louis." PhD Thesis, Université de Paris XII, Paris, 1995.
- Tilles, Gérard, and Daniel Wallach. *Les Musée les De Médecine: Histoire, Patrimoine et Grandes Figures de la Médecine en France*. Toulouse, 1999.
- Tissandier, Gaston. "L'Institut Pasteur." *La Nature*, 24 November 1888, pp. 402-406.
- Tissandier, Gaston. "J.-M Charcot." *La Nature*, 26 August 1893, pp. 193-194.
- Tissandier, Gaston. "M. Pasteur et le traitement de la rage." *La Nature*, 29 May 1886, p. 410.
- Tissandier, Gaston. *La Photographie*. Paris, 1882.
- Unna, P. G. "Lettres de Paris par P.G Unna" in *Annales de dermatologie et de syphiligraphie*, IX, Paris, 1889.
- Uzanne, J. *Figures Contemporaines II*. Paris, 1896-1908.
- Vallery-Radot, Maurice. *Pasteur*. Paris, 1994.
- Vallery-Radot, Maurice. *Pasteur, dessins et pastels*. Paris, 1987.
- Vallery-Radot, Maurice. *Pasteur savant et artiste*. Paris, 1995.
- Vallery-Radot, Pierre. "La Médecine et les Médecins dans l'oeuvre de Toulouse-Lautrec." *La Presse Médicale*, 14 July 1951, pp. 1021-1022.
- Vallery-Radot, R. *Pasteur dessinateur et pastelliste (1836-1842)*. Paris, 1912.

- Vallery-Radot, René. *La Vie De Pasteur*. Paris, 1900.
- Viardot, Louis. *Les Musées de France*. Paris, 1860.
- Vidal-Bué, Marion. *Algers et ses peintres, 1830-1960*. Paris, 2000.
- Vigarello, Georges. *Concepts of Cleanliness: Changing Attitudes in France since the Middle Ages*. Cambridge, 1988.
- Wagensteen, Owen H. and Sarah D. Wangensteen. *The Rise of Surgery from Empiric Craft to Scientific Discipline*. Minnesota, 1978.
- Waller, John. *The Discovery of the Germ: Twenty Years That Transformed the Way We Think About Disease*. Cambridge, 2002.
- Waller, Susan. "Censors and Photographers in the Third Republic of France." *History of Photography*, 23, 3, Autumn 1999, pp. 222-235.
- Waller, Susan. *Invention of the Model: Artists and Models in Paris, 1830-1870*. Burlington, 2006.
- Walton, William. *Chefs-d'oeuvre de l'exposition universelle de Paris, 1889*. Paris, 1889.
- Warner, Eric and Graham Hough. *Strangeness and Beauty: An Anthology of Aesthetic Criticism, 1840-1910*. Cambridge, 1983.
- Warner, John Harley. *Against the Spirit of the System: The French Impulse in Nineteenth-Century American Medicine*. Princeton, 1998.
- Weber, Eugen Joseph. *France: Fin De Siècle*. Cambridge, 1986.
- Wechsler, Judith. *A Human Comedy: Physiognomy and Caricature in 19th Century Paris*. London, 1982.
- Weisberg, Gabriel P. *The European Realist Tradition*. Bloomington, 1982.
- Weisberg, Gabriel P. *Against the Modern: Dagnan-Bouveret and the Transformation of the Academic Tradition*. Piscataway, 2002.
- Weisberg, Richard. "The Representation of Doctors at Work in Salon Art of the Early Third Republic", PhD dissertation, New York University, 1995.
- Weisberg, Yvonne M. L., and Gabriel P. Weisberg. *The Realist Debate: A Bibliography of French Realist Painting, 1830-1885*. New York, 1984.
- Weisz, George. *The Emergence of Modern Universities in France, 1863-1914*. Princeton, 1983.

Weisz, George. *The Medical Mandarins: The French Academy of Medicine in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries*. New York, 1995.

Weisz, George. *Divide and Conquer: A Comparative History of Medical Specialization*. New York, 2006.

White, Hayden. *Figural Realism: Studies in the Mimesis Effect*. Baltimore, 1999.

Wilkinson, Gareth. *Pasteur and Jenner: An Example and a Warning*. London, 1883.

William, Guy. *The Age of Miracles: Medicine and Surgery in the Nineteenth Century*. London, 1981.

Wolff, Albert. "Le Salon." *Le Figaro*, 30 April, 1887, pp. 1-2.

Woodall, Joanna (ed). *Portraiture: Facing the Subject*. Manchester, 1997.

Woodfield, Richard. *Framing Formalism: Riegl's Work*. Amsterdam, 2000.

Wrotnowska, Denise. "Une amitié de savants, Pasteur et Jacobsen." *Histoires des sciences médicales*, July-December 1970, pp. 137-139.

Wrotnowska, Denise. "Pasteur et l'art." *Médecine de France*, August 1955, pp. 9-16.

Young, Katherine. *Presence in the Flesh: The Body in Medicine*. London, 1997.

Z, Doctor. "L'électricité à la Salpêtrière." *La Nature*, 17 October 1885, pp. 305-306.

Zola, Émile. "Après une promenade au Salon." *Le Figaro*, 23 May 1881.

Zola, Émile. *Documents littéraires, études et portraits*. Paris, 1881.

Zola, Émile. *Thérèse Raquin*. Paris, 1867.

Zola, Émile. *Le Docteur Pascal*. Paris, 1893.